FBIS DAILY REPORT

CONTENTS

Soviet Union

Vol III No 248 *24 December 1984*

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

DISARMAMENT/START/MBFR

TASS Analyzes U.S. Position on Space Weapons AA 1
TASS Cites Weinberger on 'Star Wars' Program AA 2
Arbatov Points to Dangers of Space-Based Weapons AA 2
Reagan, Thatcher Discuss Space Weapons Deployment AA 4
[PRAVDA 24 Dec]

WORLD & REGIONAL ISSUES

Weekly 'International Observers Roundtable' CC 1
[Agayants, Levin, Tsvetov]
USSR Policy of Detente CC 1
Need for Disarmament Talks CC 1
CEMA Cooperation CC 3
Chemical Weapons in Europe CC 4
UN General Assembly Session CC 5
'International Situation Questions & Answers' CC 7
[Pravdin, Kornilov, Kolchanov, Sobolev, Korablev]
1984 Assessed CC 7
East-West Relations CC 8
Upcoming USSR-U.S. Talks CC 9
Sri Lanka Situation CC 10
Poland's Withdrawal From ILO CC 11
U.S. 'Aggressive Policy' CC 12
PRAVDA Cites De Cuellar on Gromyko-Shultz Talks [14 Dec] CC 13

UNITED STATES & CANADA

Arbatov Optimistic About Upcoming Talks With U.S. A 1

CHINA

Arkhipov Continues Official Visit to PRC B 1
Yao Yilin Gives Reception B 1
Meets With Yao Yilin B 1
Talks With Zhao Ziyang [PRAVDA 24 Dec] B 2
Trade, Science Accords Reached [PRAVDA 24 Dec] B 2

WESTERN EUROPE

Gorbachev Concludes Official Visit to UK G 1
Departure Statement G 1
Arrival in Moscow G 1
Correspondent on Visit's Success G 2
Trade Ties Discussed [IZVESTIYA 20 Dec] G 2

MIDDLE EAST & NORTH AFRICA

PRAVDA Reports on New Mauritanian Government [15 Dec] H 1
IZVESTIYA Hits Israeli Occupation of S. Lebanon [Geyvandov, 7 Dec] H 1

SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA

PRAVDA Reports Atrocities by Western-Backed UNITA [17 Dec] J 1
Ethiopian Official Lauds USSR's 'Unselfish Aid' [PRAVDA 17 Dec] J 1

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

POLITICAL & SOCIAL DEVELOPMENTS

Sokolov Appointed USSR Defense Minister R 1
Biographical Sketch R 1
Coverage of Marshal Ustinov's Death, Funeral R 1
Text of Death Announcement [SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 22 Dec] R 1
'Medical Conclusion' Issued R 2
Funeral Commission Formed R 2
Obituary Report R 2
Guard of Honor Listed R 4
1st Day Lying-in-State R 4
2d Day Lying-in-State R 5
Warsaw Pact Delegations Present R 6
Other Delegations Present R 7
USSR Committees Send Condolences R 8
Republics Send Condolences R 8
Funeral on 24 Dec [PRAVDA 24 Dec] R 9
Funeral Procession; Chernenko Absent R 10
Chernenko KOMMUNIST Article on Developed Socialism R 11

SCIENTIFIC AFFAIRS

USSR To Launch Rockets in Pacific 25 Dec-3 Jan [PRAVDA 23 Dec] U 1
Vega-2's First Telemetric Reports Analyzed U 1

TASS ANALYZES U.S POSITION ON SPACE WEAPONS

LD221752 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1636 GMT 22 Dec 84

[Prevent the Militarization of Space" -- TASS Headline]

[Text] Moscow 22 Dec (TASS) -- TASS Military Observer Vladimir Bogachev writes:

The U.S. Administration has recently unleashed some energetic propaganda defending the U.S. goal of militarizing space. In this, special emphasis has been placed on unrestrained publicity for its plans to develop a large-scale, space-based antimissile defense system. President Reagan himself has taken an active role in this campaign; he claims that the millions of people in Britain, France, the USSR, and other countries who come out in favor of a peaceful space "do not fully understand what is in question." The U.S. President, who recently called for the deployment of U.S. neutron weapons, "which kill people without harming property," is now publicizing a large-scale, space-based, antimissile defense system, asserting that it allegedly "allows the destruction of weapons without killing people at the same time."

With an apparent lack of concern about tying up the ends of his propagandistic theses, the head of the Pentagon, in his latest speech to foreign correspondents in Washington, began by saying that the U.S. antimissile defense system "will allow cutbacks in nuclear ballistic missile arsenals through negotiations," and then admitted that with the implementation of this program, the United States will also "strengthen and modernize" its own nuclear strategic forces in the future -- that is, they will continue the race in offensive weapons.

Weinberger called on the Soviet Union to give its blessing to U.S. plans to build an antimissile defense system. It follows from his speech that Washington is counting on the Soviet Union's rejection of countermeasures to the creation of the U.S. antimissile defense system. The U.S. Administration seems to be hoping that the USSR, relying on the hypocrisy of Washington's promise to "share antimissile defense technology with the entire world," will benevolently wait until the United States creates its own antimissile shield intended for the safe commission of aggression. If anyone in Washington truly harbors such illusions, they have absolutely no grounds on which to do so.

The Soviet Union recently came out with an initiative to hold talks with the United States on the entire complex of questions concerning nuclear and space weapons. On the basis of this initiative, agreement was reached with the American Administration to enter into completely new talks, which would embrace both the question of the nonmilitarization of space and questions of reducing nuclear arms--both strategic and medium-range. All of them must be examined and solved in an interconnected way. Here the space arms race is of key importance. Soviet leaders have repeatedly pointed out that -- should the United States unleash a dangerous space arms race -- this would whip up an arms race in other directions too, and would undermine the foundations of the entire process of limiting and reducing arms.

Of course, there can be no question of any consent by the Soviet Union to the legalization of the space arms race, including antimissile weapons. The USSR's approach to the problem of antimissile defense was formulated quite clearly by Soviet leader Konstantin Chernenko:

"We are resolutely opposed to the development of broad-scale systems of antimissile defense, which can only be seen as calculated to mount nuclear aggression with impunity."

"There is a permanent Soviet-American treaty on antimissile defense which bans the creation of such systems. It should be strictly observed. A formal renunciation of the very idea of deploying antimissile systems in space would be in keeping with the letter and spirit of that treaty and the task of ensuring the peaceful status of outer space in the interests of all mankind. Such a step would be received everywhere in the world as a sign of true concern for the peaceful future of mankind."

TASS CITES WEINBERGER ON 'STAR WARS' PROGRAM

LD240828 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0750 GMT 24 Dec 84

[Text] Washington, 24 Dec (TASS) -- President Reagan's administration intends to continue the race involving the most destructive and destabilizing types of armaments. This follows from a speech made on Sunday by Caspar Weinberger, U.S. defense secretary, on the ABC television program "This Week."

The United States does not intend to give up the implementation of the "star wars" program put forward by President Reagan, Weinberger said, among other things. As is known, this is a wide-scale program for the creation of a system of antimissile defense using elements based in space. The Washington administration is placing very high hopes on this kind of system, linking with it adventurist plans for achieving military superiority over the Soviet Union.

From Weinberger's utterances, it also became perfectly clear that along with the plans for the militarization of space, the administration is continuing its course towards the modernization of American nuclear missile strategic forces. In particular, he said that the United States "naturally has to modernize and strengthen its offensive systems." Among these systems the Pentagon leader singled out especially the "MX" intercontinental ballistic missiles.

The remarks of the American defense secretary are evidence of the fact that the Washington administration, which is stating in words its willingness to hold talks on arms limitation and reduction, actually has no serious constructive proposals whatsoever to make in this field and is continuing its attempts to break the existing approximate equilibrium in the military sphere, hoping to change it in its own favor.

ARBATOV POINTS TO DANGERS OF SPACE-BASED WEAPONS

LD240106 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 23 Dec 84

[Text] We continue our broadcast with certain aspects of Soviet-American relations reviewed by Dr. Georgiy Arbatov, member of the USSR Academy of Sciences and director of its Institute of United States and Canada Studies.

[Begin Arbatov recording in Russian with superimposed English translation] We view the coming talks as covering a whole complex of issues, all the main elements of the arms race which was to be stopped. These principal elements include nuclear arms, both strategic and intermediate range, and weapons systems that can be deployed in outer space. All of these are very important problems, but the one deserving the highest priority just now is the problem of space weapons. The fact is that although the American side is willing to talk about space weapons, it is in fact increasing its appropriations for systems of this type. Such an approach cannot but cause concern among all sober-thinking people, Americans included.

Let me draw your attention to a recent article in the journal FOREIGN AFFAIRS, in which such experienced politicians as Robert McNamara, Gerald Smith, and George Kennan present convincing arguments to show that it is impossible to achieve the limitation, let alone reduction, of offensive strategic arms if one or both of the sides are engaged in building up antimissile defenses. As a matter of fact, this was the official view of the United States at the very start of our negotiations. That was in fact why SALT I became possible, since it was negotiated parallel with a treaty drastically curtailing antimissile defenses. The two treaties were concluded together.

While on this subject, let me point out that the very possibility of establishing an effective antimissile defense system is highly questionable in the view of the vast majority of experts, and American experts are no exception here. This is due both to purely technical and to economic reasons for the cost of such a system would be fantastic. But irrespective of whether such a system can or cannot be created, even plans for it are having a highly adverse effect on the whole range of problems now being tackled. How can we conduct negotiations on scrapping existing missiles when we know that the other side is trying to build up a defense system for those missiles?

As for talk about these being defensive weapons, this is totally unconvincing. Whatever may be said, peace today is largely the result of deterrence on both sides. It rests on the proposition that each side is aware that if it started a nuclear war it would be subjected to a devastating strike in return. This makes a first strike pointless, but if either side in these circumstances seeks to develop an at all credible antimissile defense system, the logical conclusion is that it counts on committing aggression with impunity. Such an approach is obviously destabilizing. Since neither side wants to become a victim of aggression, it stands to reason that it will match such efforts by building up a defense system of its own and developing the offensive systems to overcome the other side's defenses.

That being so, what is the point of discussing cuts of offensive systems? What we have here is a vicious cycle. This is so obvious that I am sometimes astonished by the American attitude on this matter. One gets the impression that many people in the United States have been hibernating for the past 15 years.

Surely all those problems have been widely debated in both the United States and the Soviet Union since the end of the sixties? That was when it was concluded that developing such a defense system would not be a defensive act at all but would a very dangerous, aggressive act. For an antimissile system, far from creating stability, increases the danger of a new war. Yet, now all this is being discussed all over again, although the substance of the matter has not changed in the least. In fact, more and more authoritative and influential statesmen and experts are pointing up the dangers of space-based weapons, saying that they will make it impossible to conduct any fruitful talks on arms limitation and reduction.

So what is the way out? In my opinion, the vicious circle would be broken if the parties to the coming talks, above all the Americans, adopted a realistic approach to the matter. I cannot anticipate what the American posture at these talks will be, but I do know that in the United States there are several enthusiasts of the star wars notion and that there are naive people among the public who'll give it their backing. I can hazard a guess about the origins of this enthusiasm. It probably stems from the traumatic experience of Americans in the postwar period. In the years since World War II, they have suddenly discovered that they are no longer invulnerable as they were for centuries.

Now it is being suggested to them that this invulnerability can somehow be regained.

But the people supporting the star wars notion have no idea of the kind of Pandora's box they'll be opening, or of the troubles for all that they will be releasing in this way, not to use a stronger word. The Soviet attitude to extending the arms race to outer space has been spelled out very clearly. We want a ban on deploying any arms in space; a ban on all ground-based weapons that could strike at objects in space; a ban on their development or resting; and a moratorium on them for the present. In other words, we wish to rule out any possibility of the arms race moving into outer space. That seems to be the only rational approach. [end recording]

REAGAN, THATCHER DISCUSS SPACE WEAPONS DEPLOYMENT

PM241011 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 24 Dec 84 First Edition p 5

[TASS Report: "What the Allies Consulted Each Other About"]

[Text] Washington, December 23 -- A meeting between Ronald Reagan and British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher has been held in Camp David, the countryside residence of the U.S. President. The focus of the meeting concerned the course of preparations for the new Soviet-American negotiations with the view of attaining mutually acceptable accords on the whole package of questions concerning nuclear and space armaments. The prime minister emphasized that she warmly greeted the forthcoming negotiations.

At a press conference before flying back to London, Margaret Thatcher said that she shared impressions with Ronald Reagan on the recent visit to Britain by the delegation of the USSR Supreme Soviet led by Mikhail Gorbachev. Margaret Thatcher characterized the negotiations with Mikhail Gorbachev as a constructive, realistic, businesslike, and friendly exchange of opinions.

This Anglo-American summit meeting is presented by representatives of the administration as the manifestation of the readiness on the part of Washington to "consult on a par" with its allies on questions of arms control. But, as is reported here, during the "consultations" the United States exerted influence upon Britain in favor of unconditional support for the Pentagon's plans of development and subsequent deployment of a large-scale missile defense system with space-based elements. Margaret Thatcher said she supported the U.S. research within the framework of the so-called initiative in the sphere of strategic defense but she declared against deployment of the missile defense system within the "star wars" program. In that connection, the head of the British Government recalled that production and deployment of such systems would be in violation of the Soviet-American treaty limiting defenses against missiles and also the 1967 treaty on the principles of activities of state in exploration and uses of outer space, including the moon and other celestial bodies. The ABM treaty of 1972 concretely prohibits establishment, tests, and deployment of space-based missile defense systems or components.

The treaty of 1967, which was signed by more than 100 states, sets the principles of activities of states in exploring and using outer space, and specifically it prohibits the putting into orbit around the earth of any objects with nuclear weapons or any other types of weapons of mass destruction, establishment of military bases, structures and fortifications on celestial bodies, tests of any types of weapons and holding of military exercises. But as is clear from pronouncements of a high-placed representative of the State Department, the United States reserves the right to renounce the ABM treaty when things go as far as practical deployment of the missile defense system within the "star wars" program. As to the 1967 treaty, the representative of the Department of State did not even mention it. In this connection, attention is drawn here to President Reagan's recent pronouncements praising the initiative in strategic defenses. All that adds to the great doubts as to whether the United States intends to take a constructive stand at the coming comprehensive negotiations.

WEEKLY 'INTERNATIONAL OBSERVERS ROUNDTABLE'

LD231745 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1230 GMT 23 Dec 84

["International Observers Roundtable" program with Nikolay Ivanovich Agayants and Viktor Nikolayevich Levin, All-Union Radio commentators, and Vladimir Yakovlevich Tsvetov, political Central Television and All-Union Radio political observer.]

USSR Policy of Detente

[Text] [Tsvetov] Hello, comrades. Little more than a week remains before the start of the new year and, according to tradition, we would like to look back upon the events of the past year.

What kind of year was it in the field of international relations? If one tries to draw general conclusions about the results of the departing year, then one can say that its basic feature has been the acceleration of the social progress of mankind, the build-up in the might of socialism, which has been revealing increasingly its inexhaustible possibilities and its advantages of principle over capitalism. At the start of 1984 the representatives of the American Administration stated that they did not need detente. America's allies in the military blocs immediately responded to this statement, saying that detente was dead. The Soviet Union embarked upon 1984 with different thoughts and different intentions. The leaders of the CPSU and the Soviet Government again stressed that the Leninist principle of the peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems -- this is the initial premise of the process of detente -- is the basis of Soviet foreign policy. The Soviet leaders have once again pointed out that for the Soviet Union the policy of detente is the natural continuation of a fundamental, consistent course. Thus, the main content, the main essence, of 1984 in international relations has been the struggle between two lines: the line toward detente, toward peaceful coexistence, toward mutually advantageous cooperation, and the line toward confrontation, toward the arms race and intensifying the danger of nuclear war. One of the forms, indeed one of the most effective forms, of implementing a foreign policy course is that of personal meetings between the heads of states and governments. These contacts reduce alarming tension in mutual relations and engender trust which is so important for the strengthening of peace. The policy of different countries is explained more quickly and better in the course of personal contacts, inasmuch as information about it is received firsthand. Soviet leaders, in holding meetings with many leaders of foreign countries, have used these contacts in order to analyze problems in the international situation and to explain the reasons it has become more complicated. During their meetings at summit level, Soviet leaders have given thorough explanations of the Soviet Union's position and its peace-loving foreign policy. In the course of these contacts, Soviet leaders have made calls for resolute actions in order to curb the instigators of war and for resolute actions in defense of peace and in defense of disarmament. Any very important political initiatives have been put forward invariably during the course of these contacts.

Need for Disarmament Talks

[Levin] Vladimir Yakovlevich, now that we are already adding up the results of the year as a whole, we have complete grounds for saying that the active, peace-loving foreign policy of the Soviet Union and the other socialist states has undoubtedly borne definite fruit. Despite the fact that the situation, of course, remains very complicated, definite flashes of light on the horizon of international relations are making their appearance, and they are making their appearance first and foremost thanks to the fact that those ideas the Soviet Union has voiced both this year and in previous years are beginning to acquire material strength. In this connection, I think, the proposal that was put forward way back in March of this year by Konstantin Ustinovich Chernenko deserves special attention -- the proposal that the nuclear powers should reach agreement about norms governing relations between them.

[Agayants] As Konstantin Ustinovich Chernenko noted, in our view these norms look something like this: The prevention of nuclear war should be looked upon as the main objective of foreign policy; situations fraught with the danger of nuclear conflict should not be allowed to arise, but if that kind of danger does come about, then urgent consultations should be held in order to prevent nuclear conflagration from erupting; the propaganda of nuclear war in any form, be it global or limited, should be rejected; undertakings should be given not to be the first to use nuclear weapons; and, furthermore, the Soviet state has taken upon itself that kind of undertaking. Let us turn to some of the other points: Under no circumstances must nuclear weapons be used against non-nuclear countries, upon whose territory there are no weapons of that kind; the status of a nuclear-free zone that has already been created shall be respected and the formation of new nuclear-free zones in different parts of the world shall be encouraged; the proliferation of nuclear weapons in whatever form shall not be permitted and such weapons -- or their control -- will not be transferred to anyone, nor will they be deployed upon the territories of countries where they do not exist; the nuclear arms race will not be carried to new areas, including space; and so, step by step, upon the principle of identical security, a reduction in nuclear armaments, going as far as their complete elimination in all their varieties, shall be secured. That is our program, which was set out in March.

[Tsvetov] This program has been expressed repeatedly in Konstantin Ustinovich Chernenko and by other Soviet leaders in meetings with the heads of states and of governments of, say, France, Britain, the Federal Republic of Germany, Italy, Spain, and Finland.

[Levin] The principled approach of the Soviet Union to the solution of those problems that the world is coming up against meets the requirements of the security of other states. And the principle of all our proposals amounts to this, that it provides for equality and identical security. The Soviet Union, clearly and precisely together with its friends and allies, has stated that we are not seeking military superiority, but we will not permit the parity that already exists in the balance of armed forces and armaments, and which creates the foundation for relations of equal rights and for movement forward along the path of detente. We will not permit this parity to be broken. And you know, comrades, that this year the Soviet Union, together with its allies in the Warsaw Pact organization, has taken a number of extremely effective steps to ensure that very kind of situation in which the deployment of the American nuclear missiles in Western Europe will not give a military strategic advantage to the United States and NATO as a whole. You know that, in agreement with the GDR and Czechoslovakia, operational-tactical missiles of enhanced range have been deployed upon the territory of those states. The Soviet Union has deployed submarines carrying nuclear missiles close to the shores of the United States, as a result of which they have created a similar situation for the United States to the one that the Pershing II's and the cruise missiles are creating for us. Finally, you know that long-range cruise missiles have started to enter the armory of the Soviet Army and Navy. This shows once again that hopes of breaking the military parity, hopes of achieving military superiority by the United States are illusory. And of course this element brings in a new understanding of the international situation, and I think that it is having a effect on the attitudes of Washington politicians, too.

[Agayants] I would like to add the following to what has already been said: The Soviet Union and the countries of the socialist community are not merely putting forward new peace initiatives and proposals, they are also being attentive in their attitude to those initiatives that come from other countries in this direction.

[Tsvetov] I wanted, indeed, to draw attention to yet another aspect of the Soviet principled position about which you have just been speaking.

For example, following the meeting between Konstantin Ustinovich Chernenko and Sinowatz, the chancellor of the republic of Austria, the world press noted this aspect of the Soviet position of principle on which I now want to focus attention. The world press wrote as follows: The growing tension in the world, the continuing arms race, both in nuclear and in conventional weapons, and the danger of transforming space into an arena of military confrontation, give rise to serious concern everywhere. And in this situation the Soviet side is again displaying a willingness to hold honest talks in order to get off the ground the solution of the most important problem -- that of ending the arms race. The Soviet Union is willing to seek the most radical solutions in all directions along which it might be possible to move forward to the complete banning, and ultimately to the elimination, of nuclear weapons. That is how I want to continue your line of thought, Nikolay Ivanovich, that the Soviet Union is willing to conduct talks on equal terms and on the principles of identical security.

[Agayants] The desire of the peoples of our planet to seek ways of ending the arms race has given such a powerful impulse to the appearance of the concept of freezing nuclear arsenals both quantitatively and qualitatively. Just how popular this idea has become can be judged even by the following fact: Six neutral and nonaligned states have adopted an appeal in favor of a freeze. These steps have met with the most positive response from the Soviet Union. The idea of a freeze is achievable, practically, because parity exists. Having frozen their nuclear arsenals, the sides would be able to embark upon their reduction.

[Levin] This document which you have recalled, Nikolay Ivanovich, is also interesting for the fact that it shows what an active role is played by the nonaligned countries in the development of modern international politics. Countries of the so-called Third World by no means wish to be passive observers and are not becoming passive observers of the development of international relations. This is a very important point in modern politics, a point which has always been received with great understanding and, I would add, with respect, by the Soviet Union and other socialist countries.

[Tsvetov] We have seen examples of this in Konstantin Ustinovich Chernenko's meetings, for example, with the leaders of Ethiopia, Nicaragua, Syria, the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, the Yemen Arab Republic, and Malta. The talks with leaders of these states have again demostrated the essence of the policy of the Soviet Union in relation to nonaligned countries, which is support for their efforts to strengthen national independence and assistance for all progressive undertakings; aid to overcome economic and cultural backwardness; the observance of strict equality and noninterference in internal affairs; understanding and respect for national and historic traditions; and solidarity in the struggle against imperialism.

CEMA Cooperation

[Levin] You know, comrades, that in June of this year in Moscow there took place the economic summit of CEMA member-countries. Questions of the further development and deepening of economic and scientific-technological cooperation between CEMA member-countries were widely discussed there and, at the same time, a declaration was adopted: Preserving Peace and International Economic Cooperation.

[Agayants] Let's take a look at facts on economic cooperation among countries of the socialist community. The Moscow conference worked out a united strategic course and determined the main directions for mutual long-term cooperation. Cooperation in science and technology is acknowledged to be one of the key directions in cooperation between member countries of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance.

For this reason, it was recommended in Moscow to speed up the working out of a comprehensive program for scientific and technological progress for 15 to 20 years. It is called on, in particular, to define the development of the wider use of microprocessor technology; the creation and effective use of industrial robots; the satisfaction of the needs of the national economy of the fraternal socialist states in fuel and energy; a more thorough processing of raw and other materials; and the creation of new materials and technologies.

[Tsvetov] I would like to add a few figures to this in order to illustrate the huge scale of work which is envisaged by the comprehensive program. It is sufficient to say that in the forthcoming 5-year plan period, and in the USSR alone, 100,000 industrial robots, 4,000 automated lines, 110,000 machine tools with numerical program control, will be manufactured. And this is only in the Soviet Union. Or let's take atomic power engineering as an example. Atomic electric power stations with an overall capacity of 26 million kw are functioning at the moment in CEMA member-countries. In accordance with the comprehensive program, by 1990 the capacity of atomic electric power stations will grow to 100 million kw.

[Levin] I think that next year will bring us gratifying news. It is a year of preparation for the congresses of leading Communist Parties in the fraternal socialist countries. You know, comrades, that a congress has already taken place in Romania. In other socialist states these events are yet to come. And the precongress period, as the practice of countries of the socialist community shows, is taking place under the sign of a high creative activity of the masses and is particularly fruitful.

[Tsvetov] At the conference in Moscow a major step forward in coordinating the economic policy of the socialist community was made. But not just in economic policy...in foreign policy, too, further coordination took place of the initiatives of the socialist community aimed at achieving peace, detente, and disarmament.

[Levin] Yes, the declaration of the CEMA member-countries -- preserving peace and international economic cooperation -- sets out those peace-loving proposals which have been put forward by the socialist countries both at the political-consultative committee of Warsaw Pact member-states subsequently. It is noted in particular in that document that the proposals of most topical significance are those of socialist states to agree without delay on the full and universal banning of nuclear weapon tests; on the banning of the militarization of space, the use of force in space and from space in the direction of earth; on the banning and liquidation of chemical weapons on a worldwide scale; and, by way of a step toward this, on the liquidation of them on the European Continent.

Chemical Weapons in Europe

[Tsvetov] Konstantin Ustinovich Chernenko returned to the question of the banning and liquidation of chemical weapons on a worldwide scale and first and foremost on the European Continent in his reply to the letter from Lehlbach, a trade union figure in the FRG. Konstantin Ustinovich Chernenko wrote in his reply: The USSR and other socialist countries proposed in January 1984 that agreement be reached on liberating Europe from all types of chemical weapons. Comrade Chernenko's reply goes on to say that an accord on this would undoubtedly promote a speeding up in concluding a convention on banning chemical weapons on a general worldwide scale, which was and remains the end goal of Warsaw Pact member-states. I think it is not by chance that it was a trade union figure of the FRG who addressed a question on chemical weapons to Comrade Chernenko.

[Levin] Yes, for this he has, as they say, more than sufficient grounds.

A group of deputies from the Bundestag, from the German Social Democrat Party, at the beginning of last year, submitted a complaint to the Constitutional Court of the FRG against the government, accusing it of keeping secret from the public data on the deployment of American chemical weapons on the country's territory. Indeed, there are no full data on this, but even what is known fills the population of the Federal Republic of Germany with deep concern and it is this concern which the trade union figure Lehlbach communicated to Konstantin Ustinovich Chernenko in his letter. Here is one fact: At just one base, at just one dump in the small town of Fischbach, in the Rhineland Palatinate, more than 2,000 tons of American combat poisonous substances are stored. It has been calculated that this quantity of chemical weapons is sufficient to destroy 20 million people or one-third of the entire FRG population. It has to be said that this fully justified concern over the fate of the world is today making itself known not only in the Federal Republic of Germany, but also in other West European states, including in Britain. And not by chance, during the visit of the delegation of the USSR Supreme Soviet to Britain, the leader of our delegation, Comrade Gorbachev, stressed that when we talk about war and peace it ought to be borne in mind that the nature of modern weapons, and first and foremost nuclear weapons, has changed traditional ideas about these problems. Mankind finds itself on the threshold of a new stage in the scientific and technological revolution, which will also have an effect on the further development of military equipment. And those who resort to discourse about limited, short-lived, or drawn-out nuclear wars are obviously still held captive by stereotypes which have outlived their day, when it was a great misfortune but did not as now, threaten to destroy mankind. The nuclear age inevitably dictates new political ways of thinking. The most acute and urgent problem which now perturbs all people on earth is the problem of averting a nuclear war. And this has found very vivid reflection at the session of the UN General Assembly which has just ended.

UN General Assembly Session

[Tsvetov] Indeed, among the nearly 140 questions which were discussed by the 39th session of the UN General Assembly there were 72 questions related to disarmament and strengthening peace in the world. If the most vital among this group of questions are to be singled out -- and in my view one ought to recognize as such questions related to preventing nuclear war and the limitation of armaments -- then the agenda included nearly 30 points relevant to these problems. The way in which the participants in the United Nations General Assembly session approached these questions gives clear indication just how radically different are the positions of the socialist countries from those of the United States and its aggressive bloc allies. The Soviet Union and the other socialist countries came to the present United Nations General Assembly session bearing a big complex of important initiatives. We've just spoken about them, so I would now like only to point out the following highly remarkable fact. All Soviet initiatives, all initiatives from the other socialist countries, were reflected in one form or another in the resolutions passed by the session, and these were resolutions adopted with an overwhelming majority of votes. This goes to show that the socialist community has an exceptionally realistic, exceptionally sober approach to the current international situation. The socialist community takes into account and tries to put into practice the thoughts and aspirations of the people, not only of its constituent countries, but also those of the democratic and peace-loving levels of the population in all other countries in the world. Among the United Nations General Assembly resolutions adopted at the 39th session, I would like to single out especially the resolution which refers to preventing the militarization of space.

[Levin] The resolution on preventing the arms race in space was adopted with 127 states voting 'for'. The United States abstained.

The initiative for adopting this document came from the Soviet Union. What does this document say? Let me read just one paragraph: The General Assembly calls upon all states, particularly those with a large potential in the space sphere, to assist actively in achieving the aim of peaceful use of space, and to undertake immediate measures for preventing the arms race in space, in the interests of maintaining international peace and security, and developing international cooperation and mutual understanding.

[Agayants] It seems appropriate to note here why the United States is so stubbornly out of step with the other states. In sabotaging the implementation of the Soviet proposals aimed at the peaceful use of space, the Washington administration heeds no obstacles and leads matters towards militarizing the space around the earth. In the Pentagon they have a passionate desire for space orbits crammed with spy satellites, satellites carrying nuclear bombs, fighting stations complete with powerful lasers and other antimissile systems. Having set themselves the fruitless objective to achieve military superiority over the Soviet Union by hook or crook, the present U.S. rulers are implementing -- alongside the deployment of Pershings and Tomahawks in Western Europe -- a program to develop space strike systems intended to destroy targets in space as well as on the ground. Colossal, truly astronomical amounts of money are allocated for this purpose. Let me remind you that the secret directive on defense for 1984-1988 spells out quite clearly the necessity, and I quote, to prepare for effective military action in the space around the earth.

[Tsvetov] I would like to mention also some other resolutions passed by the 39th session of the UN General Assembly based on proposals put forward by countries of the socialist community. There is, for example, the one of stopping the development and deployment of new kinds and systems of nuclear weapons and the one on renouncing the first use of nuclear weapons. But I would like to draw particular attention to a resolution, also initiated by the socialist countries, about preventing the policy of state terrorism.

[Levin] Yes, it was the Soviet Union that put forward a draft for such a resolution, too. The meaning of this resolution is quite clear. The fact of the matter is that the United States has given state terrorism the status of official U.S. policy. The whole world saw this in the case of tiny Grenada, which was crushed under the heel of U.S. landing troops. The whole world sees this in the case of the cynical U.S. interference in Nicaragua's internal affairs, interference which threatens to grow into open military intervention, something, incidentally, which is quite frankly talked about in the United States. The resolution adopted by the UN General Assembly decisively condemns the policy and practice of terrorism in interstate relations as a method of conducting affairs with other states and peoples, and 117 states voted for this resolution. No one voted against, and 30 delegations abstained. Among those who abstained were the United States and their closest NATO allies, as well as Israel and Chile. It seems to me it is worth looking at how the United States voted during this session.

[Tsvetov] Indeed, if one looks at the whole complex of questions concerning disarmament and strengthening international security, the U.S. voted 27 times against the resolutions being proposed at the session and abstained on 14 occasions. In other words, the United States refused to support practically all measures on nuclear and conventional disarmament, on consolidating peace and security. Through its manner of voting, the United States made even clearer the nature of its foreign policy. But this is only one side of the issue. The other side is this: On 10 occasions the United States voted 'no' in complete isolation. This, it seems to me, emphasizes the growing international isolation of the United States.

[Levin] I'd say Washington is now beginning to ponder this.

[Tsvetov] Indeed, they must ponder. Although the United Nations General Assembly resolutions do not carry the force of law over UN members, as we know, nevertheless these resolutions shape world public opinion. The fact that world public opinion has now become antiwar and antinuclear proves the importance of such resolutions. The United Nations General Assembly resolutions have played a most remarkable role in shaping international public opinion.

[Levin] Sometimes our radio listeners ask: What is the UN capable of doing in practical terms? Here is a concrete example: opinion formation. Just look: A very important merging of the opinion of state officials and of states as sociopolitical structures is taking place with the opinion of the antiwar mass movement which is developing the world over. This point is very important. This too is one of the results of 1984. The initiatives of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries, the growing antiwar feelings in nonaligned states and in certain NATO countries, and the influence of public movements, all of this, in the final analysis, has given rise to the atmosphere in which in Geneva on 7 and 8 January there will be a meeting between Andrey Andreyevich Gromyko, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member, USSR Council of Ministers first deputy chairman and our country's minister of foreign affairs, and George Shultz, U.S. secretary of state.

[Tsvetov] Towards the end of its work the 39th session of the UN General Assembly adopted two resolutions looking ahead into 1985. First, a resolution was adopted on how the 40th anniversary of the UN will be marked. This resolution says the anniversary should be marked under the slogan: The UN for a better world. The session also decided that the jubilee United Nations General Assembly session in 1985 should take place simultaneously with the proclamation of the international year of peace. The other resolution of the 39th session is aimed against Nazi, fascist, and neofascist activities, against all forms of totalitarian ideology and practice based on racial intolerance hatred, and terror. This resolution declared 8 and 9 May 1985 as days for celebrating the 40th anniversary of the victory over nazism and fascism. The Soviet Union fulfilled its humanistic and internationalist mission 40 years ago by playing a decisive role in the defeat of nazism and fascism. The Soviet Union views its struggle for peace, detente, friendship, and cooperation among peoples as such a humanistic and internationalist mission. This is the banner under which the Soviet Union will conduct its foreign policy also in 1985.

With this, I'd like to take leave: all the best to you.

'INTERNATIONAL SITUATION QUESTIONS & ANSWERS'

LD220058 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1315 GMT 21 Dec 84

["International Situation -- Questions and Answers" program presented by Sergey Pravdin, All-Union Radio foreign policy commentator, with TASS Political Observer Yuriy Emmanuilovich Kornilov, and "international affairs journalists" Rudolf Kolchanov, Vitaliy Sobolev, and Vladimir Korablev]

1984 Assessed

[Excerpts] [Pravdin] 1984 is drawing to a close, and although there is still more than a week before its is actually over, as is usual on such occasions newspaper, radio and television, and news agency observers are assessing its results, including those in the field of foreign policy. In our studio today is Yuriy Emmanuilovich Kornilov, TASS political observer. If you please:

[Kornilov] Bonch-Bruyevich, one of the veterans of the Lenin guard and former administrator of the Council of People's Commissars, quotes the following event in his memoirs: In 1918, Lenin, at the Council of People's Commissars, received a sketch of a coat of arms for the young socialist state. The coat of arms had the same shape and the same emblems as it does today, though a naked sword was depicted in the middle. It's a good idea, said Vladimir Ilich, but why the sword? We have no need of conquests; a policy of conquest is totally alien to us. And he crossed out the sword with his pencil. It is right to recall this episode once again today, as the year draws to its close. Our country has been traveling along the shining road of socialism, peace, and social progress for more than 67 years, and from the very first foreign policy act of Soviet power -- the Lenin peace decree -- right up to the present day, the USSR's whole foreign policy and all its actions on the international arena have asserted one of the great truths of the 20th century: Socialism is peace.

[Pravdin] And what, in your view, is the most important of the year's political results?

[Kornilov] The year that is drawing to a close has been marked by a great and important event for the fraternal socialist countries: an economic summit conference of the CEMA member-countries took place in Moscow, the results of which have once again demonstrated convincingly that today the socialist community is a powerful and dynamically developing organism. Since 1950 industrial production in the CEMA member-countries multiplied 14 times, and their national income rose by 8.6 times. The capitalist world does not know that kind of rate. And 1984 has been a year in which the peoples of the fraternal countries of socialism handed from one to another the baton of glorious and memorable dates linked with the results of World War II and the victory over the common enemy: the 40th anniversary of the Slovak national uprising; the 40th anniversary of People's Poland, of socialist Romania, and of the socialist revolution in Bulgaria; and the 35th anniversary of the formation of the GDR. And this passing on of the baton is going to be continued, right up to the great date, 9 May next year, the 40th anniversary of the victorious defeat of Hitlerism, a defeat to which the decisive contribution was made by the Soviet people.

East-West Relations

[Pravdin] Can we speak about relations between East and West?

[Kornilov] The key problem of the present-day is to remove the threat of nuclear disaster which hangs over the planet and to halt and reverse the accelerated material preparation for war that has been unleashed by imperialism. A set of broad constructive initiatives by the USSR and other friends and allies are directed toward achieving this great aim, initiatives which have been at the center of the attention of the 39th session of the UN General Assembly, which has just ended in New York. The community of nations approved the resolution on the prevention of the arms race in space, which confirms that universal and complete disarmament under effective international control requires that outer space be used exclusively for peaceful purposes, and that all states are called upon actively to encourage the realization of this task. A resolution has been adopted on the urgent cessation and banning of nuclear weapons tests, and on banning the development and production of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of weapons of that kind. The resolution on the conclusion of an international convention on the strengthening of the security of states which do not possess nuclear weapons welcomes the obligation undertaken unilaterally by our country not to be the first to use nuclear weapons. The international community called for a freeze on nuclear weapons as an important first step along the path toward a substantial reduction in nuclear arsenals both quantitatively and qualitatively.

A resolution has been adopted aimed at banning chemical and bacteriological weapons and at creating nuclear-free zones in different regions. All this is yet further clear and convincing evidence of the fact that the purposeful and consistent foreign policy course of the USSR is in accordance with the national interests of all peace-loving states and finds increasing support among the public and the peoples of the world. The Soviet Union, when it took part in the creation of the United Nations and the drafting of its Charter, made the central task the task of maintaining universal peace and security. Our country upholds that position today, too.

Upcoming USSR-U.S. Talks

[Pravdin] Even the 1st month of the new year is being marked by an international event of extreme importance: the beginning of new Soviet-American talks in Geneva. What can be said in that connection?

[Kornilov] Today, approximately 3 weeks before the start of the talks, there is one thing one ought to be thinking about and stressing again and again: The Soviet Union is willing to consider the most radical solutions that would make it possible to move forward along courses leading to an ending of the arms race, to the banning and ultimately the complete elimination of nuclear weapons. Our country is going to the forthcoming talks, which, as is known, have as their aim the achievement of mutually acceptable accords of the entire complex of issues concerning nuclear and space armaments, with a firm resolve to achieve serious progress in the cause of reducing the danger of war. It is precisely to this that Konstantin Ustinovich Chernenko referred in his recent message to the international movement World Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War. At the same time, the USSR proceeds from the fact that the prevention of a space arms race is of key importance, for once such a race has been started it would not merely be dangerous in itself but would whip up the arms race in other directions, too.

[Pravdin] The peace offensive of socialism and socialist policies and diplomacy are growing, but the enemies of peace have certainly not laid down their arms.

[Kornilov] You are right, that is indeed the case. Although the political rhetoric being heard from the United States recently has been in a different key and there is now no shortage in Washington of trumpeted statements about their own love of peace, the essence, the pivot, of the American-NATO political course remains the same: The facts and the whole course of events confirm that imperialism, which has twice unleashed the hurricanes of destructive world wars upon mankind, still remains inseparable from crimes such as aggression, war, and unceremonious interference in the affairs of others.

[Pravdin] What recent facts do you have in mind?

[Kornilov] Facts? Yes, indeed: The General Assembly session adopted a resolution which stresses the urgent need for efforts to be doubled and redoubled for the benefit of peace and curbing the arms race. This resolution was adopted by a majority, but not unanimously. And who was it that voted against the resolution? Six Western powers, with the United States at their head. We have already spoken today about the fact that the Assembly adopted, on the initiative of the USSR, a resolution aimed at putting space beyond the reach of the arms race. This was approved by 150 states, an absolute majority of the UN member-states. Only one delegation abstained, the delegation of the United States. That is the first fact.

And here is the second one for you: At the end of last week, a NATO Council session ended in Brussels. It had coincided, in fact, with a special Atlantic anniversary, the 5th anniversary of the dangerous decision, approved by NATO, which opened up the path into Europe for American first-strike nuclear weapons. What are the results of these NATO gatherings?

To put it briefly, they amount to this, that NATO has again come out in favor of continuing the arms race, has confirmed the timetable for the deployment of the American missiles on West European soil, has again tried to put pressure on Belgium and the Netherlands, whose governments, considering the feelings of the public, have not yet given final agreement to the deployment of the American nuclear weapons in their countries. Washington, indeed, was the initiator and the pioneer of the idea that in addition to continuing nuclear weapons, NATO should also embark upon the widescale creation of conventional weapons systems which come close to weapons of mass destruction in their destructive force. The NATO alliance continues to demonstrate strength, the communique adopted in Brussels states. The threatening gesture at the military and strategic equilibrium which has come into being and the emphasis being placed upon military superiority are the most dangerous of the imperialist adventures, for it is indeed such a state that comprises the foundation of U.S. policy. Although American nuclear powder kegs are filled to the brim, in Washington they are setting in motion ever new monstrous arms race programs for nuclear, chemical and space weapons. The Pentagon budget for the 1985 fiscal year reaches nearly $300 billion, a record in the country's history.

An absurd, but extremely dangerous concept, according to which the road to disarmament lies through an intensification of material preparations for war, has been put forward and is being zealously whipped up. To whose advantage is such a course? Whose interests does it serve? It is not difficult to find the answer to these questions, if one recalls, for example, the following data: Whereas during World War I, the profits of the American arms kings amounted to $46 billion, during the years of World War II -- which cost 50 million human lives -- they put $123 billion in pure profit into their safes. Today the incomes of the American manufacturers of death continue to rise at a very rapid rate. But the time when imperialism would have been able to decide the fate of states and peoples and go unpunished is over: It has gone forever.

Thinking about what it is that will mark 1985 and analyzing the rich mosaic of stormy and complicated processes and events that are shaking the planet, millions of people are seeing not just the Monts Blancs of death-dealing weapons which have grown up through the efforts of the aggressive imperialist forces: The peoples see something else, too -- the grandeur, the might, and the sincere love of peace of the socialist community; the growing support of the constructive foreign policy initiatives of the socialist states; and the unprecendented -- as far as its mass nature is concerned -- antiwar movement, whose participants are demanding that the face of the earth be cleared of the nuclear pox. The Soviet Union sees its aim in solving jointly -- no one is capable of doing this on his own -- the most important problem, the problem that is by its very essence a common one for all countries and peoples, that of how to prevent war and how to halt the arms race. The UN General Assembly has declared 8 and 9 May next year to be days of celebrations marking the 40th anniversary of the victory over fascism in World War II. The peoples of the world remember how dearly this war cost them, this war that was unleashed by Hitler. It cost the Soviet Union more than 20 million human lives, together with incalculable suffering and destruction. Other peoples, too, paid their price, and no small price, at that. The sacrifices made in the name of this great victory cannot be allowed to have been made in vain. The slide of the world toward nuclear disaster can and must be halted.

Sri Lanka Situation

[Pravdin] Comrade Novkiov from Krivoy Rog asks us to talk about the situation in Sri Lanka.

We will carry out his request. Sri Lanka, or Ceylon as this state used to be called, is an island off the southeast coast of India. The country's economy is dominated by agriculture; Srie Lanka is well known as an exporter of its renowned tea. The country earns a great deal of revenue from foreign tourists. The island has long been especially popular with tourists. They were attracted by the country's golden beaches, the wonderful opportunities for scuba diving, and the tropical verdure found all over the island. But alarming reports about the continuing violence on the island are appearing more and more frequently in the newspapers. The tourists now prefer to spend their holidays in other, safer places.

What is the reason for the deterioration of the situation in Sri Lanka? The main reason is the differences between different religious and ethnic groups -- between the Tamils, who originate from India, and the Sinhalese, the indigenous inhabitants. The history of intercommunal conflicts on the island dates back to feudal times. This friction became a permanent feature during the period of foreign domination. It was encouraged and exploited by the colonizers, above all the British. However, even after the achievement of independence, Sri Lanka has not been able to rid itself of the grievous legacy from the past. The leaders of both communities, the Sinhalese and Tamils, have taken advantage of the situation that developed in order to further their own economic and political interests. This course led to division within the ranks of workers of differing ethnic groups. This was also accentuated by the fact that the majority of the Tamils, who make up about 20 percent of the island's population, do not have civil rights. Formally they are not citizens of Sri Lanka, even though they have been living there since the end of the last century. As they say, they are subjected to constant discrimination when seeking work or admission to higher educational establishments. The interests of the Tajils on the island are defended by the Tamil United Liberation Front, which has become the country's most important opposition force. Its strategic objective is the formation of an independent Tamil state in the north of Sri Lanka. Numerous extremist groupings, which are trying to achieve the same goal through terror, also operate on the island. Similar groupings are also operating in the interests of the Sinhalese. The enmity between the Sinhalese and the Tamils is leading to armed clashes. The situation became especially acute in July 1983. Various sources assert that the number of people killed at that time was between 300 and 1,000. Several tens of thousands were injured and left homeless.

The United States is trying to take advantage of the situation that has developed on the island. In exchange for so-called economic assistance, it decided to use Sri Lankan territory to strengthen its military might in the Indian Ocean. Visits by high-ranking U.S. military officials to the island have become more frequent. An agreement on the establishment of a radio complex for Voice of America was signed. The people of Sri Lanka are experiencing a difficult time in their history. The maintenance of peace in this region depends, to a considerable extent, on the path they choose.
[Passage omitted in which Vitaliy Sobolev answers a question on Costa Rica and its relations with Nicaragua]

Poland's Withdrawal From ILO

[Pravdin] Our listeners Yuliya Aleksandrovna Ivanovskaya from the village of Kholoscheviki in the Moscow Oblast, and also the servicemen Matveyevich and Borisenko ask: Why did Poland recently decide to withdraw from the International Labor Organization? Please give us some information about this organization.

The International Labor Organization -- ILO for short -- was set up under the League of Nations in 1922. At present, it is a specialized UN agency. It is headquartered in Geneva and has some 150 member-states. Our country joined the ILO in 1934.

But then, in connection with its withdrawal from the League of Nations, the Soviet Union ended its participation in the ILO. The Soviet Union renewed its involvement in this organization in 1954. Recently, upon the initiative of the socialist states and also of trade unions in the developing countries, the ILO has adopted a number of documents that are worthy of attention. On the whole, however, the activity of the ILO gives rise to growing censure throughout the world. The fact is that today, as was the case 65 years ago, both trade unions and representatives of governments and employers are represented in the ILO, and, what's more, with equal rights.

One is, therefore, able to cite very many examples of the political conservatism of the ILO. For example, throughout the whole time that the ILO has existed, not once have representatives of the managements of enterprises in socialist states been elected to its executive organ, the administrative council; this is only because the leading circles of the reactionary majority in this organization do not recognize the socialist system. It has to be said that several years ago the situation in the ILO became particularly acute through the fault of the imperialist forces, which unfolded a frantic antisocialist and anti-Soviet campaign. An active part in this campaign is played by the representatives of the reactionary trade unions, including the American AFL-CIO amalgamation. In the ILO, the forces of reaction have undertaken unprecedented attempts to interfere in the internal affairs of the socialist countries, particularly in the Polish People's Republic. Thus, for example, on the initiative of right-wing trade unions, a notorious investigation commission was set up in the ILO to investigate the so-called Polish question. In protest, the Polish Government was obliged to suspend its membership in the ILO. However, right-wing forces in this organization clearly contrived to exacerbate the situation, continuing without any grounds to make accusations against People's Poland about quote, violations, unquote, of trade union rights. Under these conditions the Polish Government was compelled to state that it was leaving the ILO.

The socialist countries approved this decision. Here it should be recalled that Vietnam had earlier announced its withdrawal from the ILO uder approximately analogous conditions. The legitimate question arises: What is it that has brought about this antisocialist campaign by the right-wing forces? There is no doubt about the answer: In the view of those who are organizing it, this campaign has to draw the attention of the working people away from those important questions which the current leadership of the ILO is simply ignoring. They include problems which are very acute for the capitalist countries, such as mass and chronic unemployment; the constant decline in the population's standard of living, and the violation of their civil rights. [Passage omitted in which Pravdin answers a question about partisan fighting in Colombia and the aims of the guerrillas]

U.S. 'Aggressive Policy'

[Pravdin] A regular listener to our program, Yevgeniya Kireyevskaya from the town of Venev in Tula Oblast, writes: The administration in Washington arbitrarily and high-handedly declares various parts of the world to be so-called zones of U.S. vital interest. Such a policy is a flagrant violation of international law. Indeed, the United States has arbitrarily assumed the quote, right, unquote, to declare both individual countries and entire regions to be zones of exclusive U.S. interest. Such actions are not, in fact, new. In the past, those forces, which pursue an aggressive foreign policy aimed at seizing foreign territory, behaved in the same manner or roughly the same manner. One need only recall the insane Hitlerite propaganda about lebensraum or the attempts by militaristic Japan to seize huge territories in Asia, using the imperialist slogan of creating a nortorious coprosperity sphere. The misfortunes and sufferings into which this imperial policy plunged mankind are well known. The consequences of World War II for the aggressors themselves are also well known.

Imperialist forces, above all the United States, are following an aggressive policy today. One of the most recent and, probably, most graphic examples of this was the U.S. invasion of Grenada and the establishment of an obedient puppet regime on that island. As it happens, the roots of U.S. present-day imperial policy go back a long way in history. The so-called Monroe Doctrine was invented in Washington as long ago as the beginning of the last century. On the basis of this doctrine the United States proclaimed the entire Western Hemisphere to be in its sphere of influence.

The hegemonist pretensions of the United States have become particularly intense under the present administration. Washington is arbitrarily including very diverse regions of our planet, which have important strategic significance or possess great raw material resources, in its notorious interest sphere. In the view of the Washington strategists these regions include Western Europe, the Pacific Ocean, the Persian Gulf, and the Indian Ocean. This policy of hegemonism and aggression, as Comrade Kireyevskaya quite rightly says, is a flagrant violation of international law. As Konstantin Ustinovich Chernenko and other Soviet leaders have repeatedly stressed in their speeches, the way to preserve peace on earth is through honest and equitable talks rather than an unrestrained buildup of military power and nuclear confrontation.

PRAVDA CITES DE CUELLAR ON GROMYKO-SHULTZ TALKS

PM200841 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 14 Dec 84 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Problems of the Present Which Brook No Delay"]

[Text] New York, 13 Dec -- Mankind now faces no more important task than averting a nuclear catastrophe, UN Secretary General J. Perez de Cuellar has declared.

Addressing the plenary meeting of the 39th UN General Assembly Session, he noted that this is an indispensable precondition of economic and social development and progress in the observance of human rights.

The UN secretary general called for bilateral and multilateral talks within the framework of the disarmament conference and elsewhere, with a view to achieving specific steps in the disarmament sphere. In this connection, he noted the need to conclude a general and complete nuclear weapon test ban treaty. Talks on space arms are a no less urgent demand of the times, he pointed out.

The only way to halt the arms race in space is to prevent its beginning. It is important to reach agreement on the prevention of the militarization of space as soon as possible, before it is too late.

Dwelling on USSR-U.S. relations, J. Perez de Cuellar noted that all those present in the UN General Assembly plenary sessions hall shared the hope that the upcoming meeting in Geneva between the USSR Foreign Minister A.A. Gromyko and U.S. Secretary of State G. Shultz would be a step in this direction which accords with universal interests.

ARBATOV OPTIMISTIC ABOUT UPCOMING TALKS WITH U.S.

LD221841 Moscow World Service in English 1610 GMT 22 Dec 84

[Text] The director of the Institute of United States and Canada Studies, Dr Georgiy Arbatov, a member of the Soviet Academy of Sciences, recently returned from a trip to the United States. Here is what he told our reporter about his impressions:

[Begin Arbatov recording in Russian fading into English translation] A single trip can be misleading, since you can see a limited number of people during it, but still I got the impression that the political climate in America had improved as far as Soviet-American relations are concerned. I believe this change is a measure of concern in the country about the arms race, the poor state of Soviet-American relations which has existed for some time already, and about international tensions in general. The agreement on a meeting between Andrey Gromyko and George Shultz naturally has had positive effects on this political climate. Needless to say, this makes me feel optimistic, though I must admit that what we have at the moment is only agreement to begin talking. There have been no real breakthroughs in our relations, but it is breakthroughs that we need, since we have had 3 years of fruitless talks. While these talks were going on, tensions, mistrust, and suspicions are growing, and the arms race was escalating. [sentence as heard] We'd hate to have more such negotiations.

The importance of talks depends on their results. What is needed is readiness to work for mutually acceptable decisions aimed at normalizing bilateral relations, easing international tensions, and eliminating the threat of nuclear war. The Americans I met during this trip voiced the same view. What is more, there seemed to be a great desire than ever before [as heard] to meet with Soviet people and promote a dialogue at various levels and in various fields. In my case, I met with scientists who want to set up contacts in a wide variety of scientific fields, and I think this is a very good desire. For our part, we always call for cooperation. This would benefit both sides, if only in the sense of getting to know each other's ways of life better.

I noticed during my trips to America how little its people know about the Soviet people and how many wrong views they have about this country. Ordinary people, and even intellectuals and government officials, can display an amazing lack of knowledge about the Soviet Union. When you come to think of it, this is not so surprising as its is dangerous. We cannot judge each other on the basis of wrong views and opinions, so it is really nice to see Americans' common sense beginning to prevail. I believe there is a growing understanding in America that we live on the same planet and cannot hide ourselves from each other. For this reason, we need to learn to live side by side on the basis of mutual respect. We in the Soviet Union call this peaceful coexistence. The Americans also recognize this principle officially.

The world is facing problems which require a certain degree of cooperation between the Soviet Union and the United States. Besides, the two countries have enough problems of their own without going on to exhaust each other through a futile arms race threatening their existence and that of all mankind. This would only lead to global tragedy. 1985 should be a very important year. It is to show whether things will go beyond mere rhetoric and result in mutually acceptable agreements. I hope that this will come about since otherwise there might be dangerous developments. It should be borne in mind that we have not much time left for solving these vital problems of our day. [end recording]

ARKHIPOV CONTINUES OFFICIAL VISIT TO PRC

Yao Yilin Gives Reception

LD211634 Moscow TASS in English 1618 GMT 21 Dec 84

[Text] Beijing December 21 TASS -- Talks have opened here today between Ivan Arkhipov, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and Yao Yilin, vice premier of the PRC State Council.

In the evening, Yao Yilin gave a reception in the hall of the National People's Congress in honour of Ivan Arkhipov. The PRC vice premier of the State Council expressed conviction that the visit would serve towards further strengthening and developing the relations of cooperation between the two countries in the economic, trade, scientific-technical and other fields. He pointed out that the visit will mark a rise in the level of contacts and ties between the USSR and the PRC.

In his address Ivan Arkhipov drew attention to the statement by Konstantin Chernenko, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, president of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, to the effect that the Soviet Union "invariably strives for an improvement of relations with the PRC, is making adequate steps in that direction and always keeps open the door to constructive talks with China."

The Soviet Union welcomes the development of the positive tendencies, which have appeared in recent years in the relations between the USSR and the PRC, Ivan Arkhipov pointed out. "The Soviet Union favours a further development of ties and contacts between our countries."

Meets With Yao Yilin

LD221718 Moscow TASS in English 1711 GMT 22 Dec 84

[Text] Beijing December 22 TASS -- First deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, Ivan Arkhipov, staying here at the invitation of the PRC Government continued talks today with Deputy Premier of the PRC State Council Yao Yilin on questions of the further development of commercial, economic, scientific and technical ties between the Soviet Union and China.

In connection with the demise of the USSR Defence Minister Marshal of the Soviet Union Dmitriy Ustinov, Yao Yilin expressed profound condolences to the Soviet people, the USSR Government and the family of the deceased.

On the same day Ivan Arkhipov visited the Yanshang petro-chemical complex near Beijing.

Member of the Political Bureau, member of the Secretariat of the CPC Central Committee, Deputy Premier of the PRC State Council Wan Li gave a reception in Ivan Arkhipov's honour.

Talks With Zhao Ziyang

PM241010 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 24 Dec 84 First Edition p 4

[TASS report under the general heading "Talks Held"]

[Text] Beijing, December 23 -- Member of the Standing Committee of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China, Premier of the State Council of the People's Republic of China Zhao Ziyang received today First Deputy Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers Ivan Arkhipov, now on a visit here at the invitation of the Government of the People's Republic of China.

Questions of further development of cooperation between the USSR and the People's Republic of China in economy, trade, science, and technology were discussed during the course of the talk.

Ivan Arkhipov invited the deputy premier of the State Council to come to the USSR for a return visit in 1985. The invitation was accepted by the Chinese side with gratitude.

USSR Ambassador to the People's Republic of China Ilya Shcherbakov and persons accompanying Ivan Arkhipov on his trip to the People's Republic of China were present during the conversation.

Trade, Science Accords Reached

PM241009 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 24 Dec 84 First Edition p 4

[Text] Beijing December 23 TASS -- First Deputy Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers Ivan Arkhipov and Vice Premier of the State Council of the People's Republic of China Yao Yilin held three meetings from 21-23 December, familiarizing each other with the economic situation in their countries and exchanging opinions on questions of further development of trade-economic and scientific-technical cooperation between the two countries.

The two sides discussed questions of signing an agreement on economic and technical cooperation, an agreement on scientific-technical cooperation, and an agreement on setting up a Soviet-Chinese commission for economic, trade and scientific-technical cooperation. An accord was reached these questions.

Both sides agreed to sign in the first half of 1985 a long-term agreement on trade and payments for 1986-1990. Negotiations will be held in this connection between relevant organizations of the sides in the first quarter of 1985.

An exchange of opinions on questions of bilateral relations took place in the course of the negotiations.

The negotiations were held in a well-wishing and constructive atmosphere.

GORBACHEV CONCLUDES OFFICIAL VISIT TO UK

Departure Statement

LD211647 Moscow TASS in English 1643 GMT 21 Dec 84

[Text] Edinburgh December 21 TASS -- A USSR Supreme Soviet delegation, led by member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, chairman of the Foreign Affairs Commission of the Soviet of the Union of the USSR Supreme Soviet Mikhail Gorbachev, today made a sightseeing tour of Scotland's capital.

Mikhail Gorbachev had a conversation with Secretary of State for Scotland George Younger.

A reception was held in honor of the USSR Supreme Soviet delegation, at which Chairman of the Executive British Branch of Inter-Parliamentary Union Peter Temple-Morris, George Younger and Mikhail Gorbachev exchanged speeches.

The delegation left Edinburgh for Moscow on the same day. Before departure, at the airport, Mikhail Gorbachev made a statement for the press, saying:

On behalf of the delegation of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, I would like to convey our heartfelt gratitude to the British Parliament for the invitation to visit Great Britain. We had what we consider to be fruitful meetings with Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher, Foreign Secretary Geoffrey Howe, other members of the cabinet, representatives of political parties and business circles, visited a number of British industrial and agricultural enterprises and firms. Major questions of the present international situation and Soviet-British relations were discussed.

I would like to stress with satisfaction that our conversations and meetings passed in a business-like and friendly atmosphere and undoubtedly were useful.

It is my profound conviction that a good beginning has been made for carrying on a political dialogue between our countries. The Soviet delegation leaves with the conviction that the British side shares this point of view. We believe that in the present complex and tense situation in the world it is especially important to show goodwill, common sense, prudence, high responsibility, to come to realize that the arms race cannot, is unable to ensure the security of anyone. The important thing is to develop relations between states with different socio-political systems on the basis of equality and with account of the legitimate interests of each other. Such is the Soviet Union's position.

The head of the USSR Supreme Soviet delegation expressed deep gratitude to the secretary of state for Scotland, George Younger, for the warm reception on the soil of Scotland. On behalf of the USSR Supreme Soviet delegation and from himself personally Mikhail Gorbachev conveyed best wishes of peace and well-being to the people of Great Britain.

Arrival in Moscow

LD212045 Moscow TASS in English 2039 GMT 21 Dec 84

[Text] Moscow December 21 TASS -- A USSR Supreme Soviet delegation, led by member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, chairman of the Foreign Affairs Commission of the Soviet of the Union of the USSR Supreme Soviet Mikhail Gorbachev has returned to Moscow from Great Britain.

The delegation was met at the airport by member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Solomentsev, Vice President of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet Antanas Barkauskas, Chairman of the Soviet of the Union of the USSR Supreme Soviet Lev Tolkunov, Secretary of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet Tengiz Menteshashvili, by other officials. [Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 2050 GMT on 21 December reports that the following officials were also present at the airport to greet Gorbachev: Comrade Rusakov, CPSU Central Committee secretary; Comrade Voss, chairman of the Soviet of the Union and the Soviet of Nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet; and USSR Supreme Soviet Deputies Comrades Boglyubov, Karlov, Korniyenko, and Kruchina.]

Correspondent on Visit's Success

LD222243 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 22 Dec 84

[From the Vremya newscast; Vitaliy Ilyashenko report from London over video]

[Text] For a week, attention throughout Britain was focused on the visit of the USSR Supreme Soviet delegation headed by Comrade Gorbachev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. Meetings and conservations were awaited with interest in British political and business circles. The delegation's arrival war also awaited by ordinary Britons, seriously concerned at the growth in the threat of was and the standstill in British-Soviet relations. Would it succeed in bringing a thaw in the development of bilateral links, strengthening mutual understanding, and taking a step in the direction of detente and improving the international situation? This was the question that excited many people here.

Over these days, we have had meetings with many British political observers. All are agreed that Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's conversations with Prime Minister Thatcher and other statesmen have given fresh impetus to dialogue between East and West, a dialogue aimed at seeking ways of preventing war and strengthening international cooperation.

Even the British bourgeois press has been forced to acknowledge that the Supreme Soviet delegation came to Britain on a mission of peace and good-neighborliness. And that mission has been crowned with success. The businesslike and frank exchange of opinions enabled the two countries' positions on a broad spectrum of international problems to be clarified, and made it possible to map out prospects for expanding bilateral economic and trade links and to raise British-Soviet relations to a new level.

Trade Ties Discussed

PM201455 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 20 Dec 84 Morning Edition p 4

[Own correspondent V. Skosyrev dispatch: "For a Stable Business Partnership"]

[Text] London -- The visit of the USSR Supreme Soviet delegation headed by M.S. Gorbachev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, remains at the center of attention for the British people. Newspapers, radio, and television provide detailed coverage of the course of the delegation's talks and meetings and describe our deputies' visits to firms which maintain business ties with the USSR.

Here, despite the diversity of opinions being expressed, the majority of newspapers agree that the visit serves the development of Soviet-British relations. At any rate, THE GUARDIAN emphasizes, M.S. Gorbachev's talks with Prime Minister M. Thatcher and Foreign Secretary G. Howe have shown that both sides want to expand contacts at very different levels.

The speech by M.S. Gorbachev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and head of the USSR Supreme Soviet delegation, in the British Parliament aroused great interest among the legislators here. Sharing his impressions with me, Labor Member of Parliament J. Lamond said:

"The meeting was very useful. It gave us an opportunity to obtain firsthand information about the Soviet Union's foreign policy and its peace initiatives aimed at preventing nuclear war and restoring the climate of detente. The Soviet parliamentarians have been here for just a few days, but it is already clear that their visit is helping to dispel many of our false ideas about life in your country."

The fact that good-neighborly cooperation between the two peoples is not only possible, but is also being implemented in everyday practice is evidenced by the experience of many British firms which have established business ties with our country. They include the Imperial Chemical Industries [ICI] concern, one of whoe research establishments the Soviet delegation visited.

ICI's contacts with our foreign trade organizations are multifaceted. Suffice it to say that we purchase from ICI plant-protection agents, dyes, chemicals, and manufacturing processes for the construction of chemical plants. ICI in turn imports petroleum products and many other commodities from the USSR.

"What significance does your firm attach to the Soviet market?" -- I put this question to R. French, head of ICI's East European department.

"The USSR is a first-rate industrial power, and we are convinced that trade with it opens up great prospects," R. French replied. "We seek to build ties with Soviet partners on a long-term basis, regardless of fluctuations in the political climate. But, naturally, the more stable political relations are between states, the more favorable conditions are for trade. Therefore, we are glad the Soviet delegation has come, and we wish it success."

PRAVDA REPORTS ON NEW MAURITANIAN GOVERNMENT

PM191441 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Dec 84 First Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Policy Statement by Mauritania's New Government"]

[Text] Tabat, 14 Dec -- The main task of the new leadership of Mauritania's Military Committee for National Salvation [CMSN] is to restore confidence in state institutions and ensure social justice in the country, a statement adopted at a CMSN session said: The document, which was transmitted on Nouakchott radio, sets out the main directions of the CMSN's domestic and foreign policy following the changes which occurred 12 December.

The committee was reorganized, the document notes, in connection with the grave crisis being experienced by Mauritania, which has paralyzed the state apparatus. Among the causes which resulted in this situation were the corruption, the squandering of national resources, and the abuse of personal power which were very widespread under deposed head of state Mohamed Khouna Ould Haydala.

The statement contains an appeal to all citizens to actively involve themselves in the process of the socioeconomic and cultural development of Mauritania. The CMSN assigns an important role here to public organizations which under the previous head of state were turned "into a tool for creating a personality cult."

In the foreign policy sphere the CMSN stated its intention to respect all the international commitments undertaken by the country. The document expresses support for the national liberation struggle of the Arab people of Palestine and resolutely condemns Zionism and the criminal system of racial discrimination in South Africa. The CMSN confirmed Mauritania's recognition of the Saharan Arab Democratic Republic. The committee stressed the need to settle the problem of the Western Sahara by means of talks in the interests of establishing peace in the region.

New CMSN chairman Maaouya Sidi Ahmed Ould Taya has been declared head of state. He is at the same time prime minister and national defense minister. There are 18 ministers in the government he has formed, including 8 members of the previous cabinet. Major Cheik Sid 'Ahmed Ould Babamine has become minister of foreign affairs and cooperation, and Lt Colonel Dibril Ould Abdallah has been appointed minister of the interior [title as published].

According to reports from Nouakchott, former head of state Mohamed Khouna Ould Haydala was arrested on his return to the country.

IZVESTIYA HITS ISRAELI OCCUPATION OF S. LEBANON

PM231943 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 7 Dec 84 Morning Edition p 5

[Konstantin Geyvandov "Political Observer's Opinion": "Leaving in Order to Stay"]

[Text] Lebanon adheres to firm principles. It demands the complete and unconditional withdrawal of Israeli troops which occupy a considerable part of Lebanese soil, and the establishment of Lebanese sovereignty over the whole of the country's territory. UN Security Council Resolutions 508 and 509 are precise on this score.

That was how Lebanese Prime Minister R. Karami described his government's stance to me in conversation in Beirut on the eve of the Lebanese-Israeli military talks under UN auspices. Those talks began in the small town of Al-Naqurah on 8 November. Here the prime minister stressed that the Lebanese side was well aware of the Israeli aggressors' habits and expected considerable difficulties since Tel Aviv would of course use every kind of trick to derive military and political benefits for itself. The fact that the talks at Al-Nquarah have been at a virtual standstill bears out the well-foundedness of Lebanese fears.

Moreover, this became clear from the very first Lebanese-Israeli meeting at Al-Naqurah, when the sides made their stances known. State and political leaders in Lebanon explained to me that what was proposed was the organization of strictly military and technical talks to determine the procedure for the Israeli occupation troops' withdrawal from southern Lebanon and the transfer of that territory to Lebanese government sovereignty, and the Lebanese military delegation is adhering to that framework. However, what aims exactly are being pursued by the Israelis? The following statement made to the West German newspaper BILD ZEITUNG by Israeli Prime Minister S. Peres gives an idea of their trust: "We would like to settle the problem in Lebanon, and to do so by means of an agreement which would enable us to leave Lebanese territory and at the same time ensure the security of our northern borders."

The essence of this policy can be summed up in a single word. "expansion." How else indeed can you explain the fact of one state intending to ensure the security of its own borders by settling problems in a neighboring state, and moreover by means of a special agreement. As an essential component of the agreement the Israeli side is insisting that the "security of Israel's northern borders" be ensured by moving the UN Interim Forces in Lebanon presently stationed in southern Lebanon, deeper into the country, to the area between the Al-Litani and Al-Zahrani Rivers, and that the territory from the Al-Litani up to the state border be placed under the control of their puppets, subunits of the "army of southern Lebanon."

Naturally these conditions are unacceptable to Beirut, since they deny Lebanon's sovereignty over part of its territory and in practice pursue the aim of maintaining its occupation by means of detachments which are armed, trained, and financed by Israel. The aims, in other words, is to turn it into an Israeli protectorate. Tel Aviv is pursuing the same aims at the present military talks as those it counted on obtaining through the 17 May 1983 agreement, which was imposed on Lebanon with the active assistance of the United States but which was repudiated as a result of the Lebanese people's heroic opposition. The goals may be summed up in the formula, "Leaving in order to stay."

Despite the Lebanese side's rejection at the talks of Israel's terms, Tel Aviv, judging by all accounts, has no desire to give up its intention of imposing them on Beirut in one form or another and is using military force for the purpose of blackmail and pressure. Let us begin with an example of flagrant provocation, the arrest by the Israeli occupiers of a group of leaders of the Shi'ite Amal movement in the south of Lebanon after the very first meeting in Al-Naqurah and the making of a cease-fire on the part of the Lebanese resistance movement's fighters a condition of their release. When they failed to break the Lebanese by means of this provocation the occupiers used even cruelier means and began barbaric air bombardment of Lebanese territory in the al-Biqa' Valley.

The Israeli leaders then laid yet another trap. They declared that they were establishing a 3-month deadline for attaining results at the talks with Lebanon and that in the event of their failure they would begin to act as they thought fit. The point of the ultimatum is simple, particularly as the Israeli side is adopting an obstructionist stance and is deliberately putting forward conditions which are unacceptable to Lebanon. It is obvious that all Tel Aviv's efforts are designed to ensure that at the end of the 3 months, or perhaps even earlier, it is Lebanon which will stand indicated for the talks' failure and that the long-considered Israeli "plan of unilateral measures to secure Israel's northern borders" will be implemented with the occupation troops' partial redeployment. This in turn should lead to the same result -- the transformation of southern Lebanon into an Israeli protectorate.

In analyzing as a whole the Israeli occupiers' present actions in Lebanon it is difficult to avoid the impression that they have been coordinated and are being carried out with the approval of Israel's senior partner in the "strategic alliance" -- the United States. The following is just on eloquent aspect of it. When U.S. State Department Spokesman J. Hughes was asked the other day at a press conference how Washington regarded the Israeli Air Force's bombing of Lebanese territory, his reply was: "No comment." Almost simultaneously a report appeared in the American press that slightly earlier U.S. military leaders had themselves made preparations to mount a bombing strike against Lebanon and that the corresponding order had been given to the aircraft carrier Eisenhower.

In all probability precisely this turn of events was foreseen by the Lebanese, who claimed when I was in Lebanon last month that, despite the talk about a forthcoming withdrawal of Israeli troops from southern Lebanon, Tel Aviv was planning a long occupation of that part of the country. This standpoint was maintained in particular by N. Birri, minister for the affairs of southern Lebanon and reconstruction, who added in conversation that armed resistance against the interventionaists will continue until the last Israeli soldier leaves Lebanese territory. It is easy to appreciate how the Lebanese people, in addition to a natural desire to liberate part of their country from foreign invaders, also link with this great hopes for settling Lebanon's internal crisis, a settlement which the Israeli occupiers and their agents are doing everything possible to impede.

If, however, you look still farther ahead, it becomes obvious that Tel Aviv, with the blessing of its Washington patrons, is dragging out its occupation of southern Lebanon and is hindering the achievement of national consensus in Lebanon in order to divert attention from and push into the background the broader problem of the need for an all-embracing, just, and durable Near East settlement. The latter question has in recent days again been the object of intense discussion at the present UN General Assembly session, which has confirmed the urgent need to collectively seek ways of resolving the dangerously explosive problems of the Near East at an international conference specially convened for that purpose. And I believe that the earliest fulfillment of UN Security Council Resolutions 508 and 509 would play a constructive role in creating a favorable climate for an overall Near East settlement.

PRAVDA REPORTS ATROCITIES BY WESTERN-BACKED UNITA

PM211149 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 17 Dec 84 First Edition p 5

[Own correspondent M. Zenovich report under general heading "Trying To Stifle Freedom"]

[Text] Luanda, 16 Dec -- The newspaper JORNAL DI ANGOLA has reported that about 140 persons, mainly women, children, and old people, were murdered as a result of carnage perpetrated last week by terrorists from the National Union for the Total Independence of Angola against the civilian inhabitants of the settlement of Longonjo (Huambo Province). Economic installations were also destroyed. According to reports from Huambo, foreign mercenaries from the United States and South Africa participated in the raid together with the bandits. It is noted that the population of Longonjo and the few rightists from the People's Armed Forces for the Liberation of Angola, despite the enemy's clear superiority in personnel and equipment, offered staunch defense. Even pupils from the local primary school headed by school director Ignacio Kapingala fought in the battle.

Angola's news agency ANGOP notes in its commentary that the main responsibility for the policy of armed banditry and attempts to destablize Angola lies with U.S. imperialism and the racist South African regime. In carrying out major terrorist operations against the Angolan people, Washington and Pretoria are expecting to crush Angola's will and impose their own order on independent Africa, and in particular a neocolonialist resolution of the Namibia problem. These actions totally expose the hypocrisy and falsity of Pretoria's "peace initiatives."

ETHIOPIAN OFFICIAL LAUDS USSR'S 'UNSELFISH AID'

PM191623 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 17 Dec 84 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Thousands of Lives Saved. Soviet Aid to Ethiopia"]

[Text] Addis Ababa, 16 Dec -- The fraternal Soviet Union is rendering Ethiopia truly invaluable assistance in its struggle against the drought which has hit the country, (Khabte-Mariam Ayyenachou), deputy commissioner for drought relief and rehabilitation, has declared.

At a difficult time for us, he noted, the land of the soviets responded immediately to the Ethiopian Government's request for help in liquidating the consequences of the natural calamity. The food and medicines delivered by the USSR have already saved thousands of lives. Lately, the commission has been experiencing an acute shortage of transportation facilities, (Khabte-Mariam Ayyenachou) announced. Under these circumstances, growing significance is attached to the successful work done by aviation detachments and truck convoys which have arrived from the Soviet Union and whose operators have ensured uninterrupted deliveries of freight to remote regions in the country. Furthermore, Aeroflot aircraft and helicopters are flying regularly to particularly inaccessible regions, carrying food and evacuating the victims. Soviet people's unselfish aid, the deputy commissioner stressed, sets an example of true internationalism in action and will always live in the Ethiopian people's memory.

Today Aeroflot aircraft and helicopters evacuated about 42,000 persons from the drought zone and delivered 3,700 metric tons of various freight to victims. At the same time Ethiopia is receiving aid from other socialist community countries. In the last 2 days alone, 35 trucks and a large shipment of food and urgently needed supplies have arrived from the GDR, together with 7 metric tons of multivitamins from Poland.

SOKOLOV APPOINTED USSR DEFENSE MINISTER

LD221304 Moscow TASS in English 1303 GMT 22 Dec 84

[Text] Moscow December 22 TASS -- The Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet appointed Marshal of the Soviet Union Sergey Sokolov to the post of minister of defence of the USSR.

Biographical Sketch

LD221336 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1322 GMT 22 Dec 84

[Text] Marshal of the Soviet Union Sergey Leonidovich Sokolov was born in 1911 in the family of an office worker. He has been a member of the CPSU since 1937 and has been in the Soviet Army since 1932. In 1947 he graduated from the Military Academy of Armored and Mechanized Troops and in 1951 graduated from the Military Academy of the General Staff.

In the period of the Great Patriotic War he was chief of staff of the headquarters commanding the armored and mechanized troops of the front and commander of the armored and mechanized troops of the Army.

In the postwar years he was commander of a tank regiment, mechanized divisions, chief of staff of an army and commander of an army. In 1960 he became chief of staff of the Moscow Military District.

In 1964 he became first deputy commander and in 1965 commander of the troops of the Leningrad Military District. Since April 1967, he has been USSR first deputy defense minister. He is a member of the CPSU Central Committee and deputy to the USSR Supreme Soviet.

COVERAGE OF MARSHAL USTINOV'S DEATH, FUNERAL

Text of Death Announcement

PM211726 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 22 Dec 84 First Edition p 1

["From the CPSU Central Committee, USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and USSR Council of Ministers" -- SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA headline]

[Text] The CPSU Central Committee, USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and USSR Council of Ministers announce with deep sorrow that Dmitriy Fedorovich Ustinov, eminent figure of the Communist Party and the Soviet state, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, USSR defense minister, marshal of the Soviet Union, USSR Supreme Soviet deputy, Hero of the Soviet Union, and Twice Hero of Socialist Labor, died on 20 December 1984, aged 76, after a grave illness.

CPSU Central Committee

USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium

USSR Council of Ministers.

'Medical Conclusion' Issued

LD211812 Moscow TASS in English 1808 GMT 21 Dec 84

[Text] Moscow December 21 TASS -- A medical conclusion has been issued here about the disease and the cause of death of Dmitriy Ustinov. The conclusion signed by prominent Soviet medical men says that Dmitriy Ustinov fell ill with pneumonia late in October 1984, which then complicated with a sepsis. Subsequently, during the recovery period, signs appeared of a beginning rupture of atherosclerotic aneurysm of the abdominal aorta. A surgical operation was performed on the aorta on the basis of generalised symptoms. In the post-operation period there appeared malfunctions of the liver, kidneys, and of a coagulability trouble. [sentence as received] Intensive therapy produced no effect. In the conditions of growing insufficiency of the liver and kidneys, of expressed metabolic and dystrophic changes in the organs, death resulted from a cardiac arrest at 19 hours 35 minutes on December 20.

The post-mortem examination confirmed the diagnosis.

Funeral Commission Formed

LD211933 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 21 Dec 84

[From the Vremya newscast]

[Text] In the CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Council of Ministers -- The CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers have passed the following decisions: First, that a government commission should be set up to organize the funeral of Marshal of the Soviet Union Dmitriy Fedorovich Ustinov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, USSR minister of defense, comprising Comrade Romanov as chairman and Comrades Grishin, Chebrikov, Smirnov, Sokolov, Akhromeyev, Yepishev, Bogolyubov, Smirtyukov, Dmitriyev, and Kudinov. Second, to bury Dmitriy Fedorovich Ustinov at the Kremlin Wall in Red Square.

The government commission announces that access to the House of Columns of the House of the Unions for the purpose of bidding farewell to the late Dmitriy Fedorovich Ustinov will be open on 22 and 23 December between 1100 and 1800 hours.

Obituary Report

LD212356 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 21 Dec 84

[From the Vremya newscast]

[Text] An obituary signed by the leaders of the Communist Party and Soviet state and by prominent military commanders says:

Dmitriy Fedorovich Ustinov lived a vivid, glorious life. At the wish of the party he headed important sectors of state construction and the national economy. He held senior posts in the central organs of the party and state and was a major organizer of the defense industry and leader of the USSR Armed Forces. The supply of arms and military equipment to the Soviet Army and Navy during the years of the Great Patriotic War is associated with his name. He made a substantial contribution to the creation of missile technology and to the conquest of space.

Dmitriy Fedorovich Ustinov was born into a worker's family in the town of Kuybyshev in 1908. In 1922 he joined the Red Army as a volunteer. Following service in the Army, he completed a vocational-technical school and worked as a metal worker and diesel engine driver in the towns of Balakhna and Ivanovo. In 1927 he became a member of the Communist Party. Upon finishing the Leningrad Military Mechanics Institute in 1934, Dmitriy Fedorovich Ustinov worked as an engineer at a scientific-research institute. Starting in 1937, he became a design engineer, deputy chief designer, and subsequently director of the Leningrad "Bolshevik" Works. Here his talent as designer and production organizer came to the fore.

In June 1941, Dmitriy Fedorovich Ustinov was appointed USSR people's commissar for armaments. Taking charge of the assimilation and mass production of weapons during the Great Patriotic War, he did a great deal to ensure victory over Hitlerite fascism and Japanese militarism.

From 1946 to 1957 Dmitriy Fedorovich Ustinov was USSR minister for the defense industry. Subsequently, he was appointed deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and, in March 1963, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the Supreme Council of the National Economy of the USSR. In 1965, Dmitriy Fedorovich Ustinov was elected secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. At the 19th, 20th, 22d, 23d, 24th, 25th, and 26th party congresses, Dmitriy Fedorivich Ustinov was elected member of the CPSU Central Committee. From 1965 to 1966 he was candidate member of the Presidium of the CPSU Central Committee. From 1966 to 1976, he was candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo. Since 1976, Dmitriy Fedorovich has been a member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo.

Dmitriy Fedorovich Ustinov was a deputy of the USSR Supreme Soviet of the 2d and 4th to the 11th convocations and a deputy of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet of the 5th and 7th to the 10th convocations. In April 1976 he was appointed USSR Minister of Defense. In this office, Marshal of the Soviet Union Dmitriy Fedorovich Ustinov firmly and steadfastly implemented the party's policy of safeguarding the defense capability of the Soviet state. He rendered great services in raising the combat readiness of the Army and Navy and in the training and education of the personnel of the Armed Forces. He was active in strengthening the combat cooperation between the USSR Armed Forces and the armies of the Warsaw Pact member-states.

As head of the USSR Ministry of Defense, he carried out major public and political work and was closely associated with labor and military collectives and party organizations. He had a sense of innovation and a creative approach toward the matter at hand and the ability to organize people to perform great and responsible tasks, and this was vividly manifested in his activities to strengthen the defense might of our homeland. His high sense of principle, devotion to the cause of the party, modesty, and sincere responsiveness earned him the love and deep respect of the Soviet people. He was for them an example of selfless service to the homeland and loyalty to communist ideals.

Dmitriy Fedorovich Ustinov's great services were given a high assessment by the party and state. He was accorded the title Hero of the Soviet Union and Twice Hero of Socialist Labor. He was awarded 11 Orders of Lenin; the Order of Suvorov, first class; The Order of Kutuzov, first class; medals of the Soviet Union; and also lofty awards from many states. He won the Lenin Prize and USSR state prizes. The personnel of the USSR Armed Forces and all Soviet people will always retain in their memory the shining image of the Communist and Leninist, ardent patriot and internationalist, and outstanding military commander Dmitriy Fedorovich Ustinov, the obituary says.

Guard of Honor Listed

LD221053 Moscow TASS in English 1037 GMT 22 Dec 84

[Text] Moscow December 22 TASS -- The CPSU and the Soviet people suffered a grave loss. Dmitriy Ustinov, an outstanding leader of the Communist Party and the Soviet state, a member of the Politbureau of the CPSU Central Committee, minister of defence of the USSR, marshal of the Soviet Union and deputy to the USSR Supreme Soviet, passed away.

The casket with the body of the decreased was today mounted on a high pedestal amidst flowers in the columned hall of the House of the Trade Unions in Moscow.

The first guard of mourning was stood by members of the governmental commission for the organisation of the funeral.

At 12 a.m. the guard of honour was filled by Comrades Konstantin Chernenko, Geydar Aliyev, Mikhail Gorbachev, Victor Grishin, Andrey Gromyko, Dinmukhamed Kunayev, Grigoriy Romanov, Mikhail Solomentsev, Nikolay Tikhonov, Petr Demichev, Vladimir Dolgikh, Vasiliy Kuznetsov, Boris Ponomarev, Viktor Chebrikov, Mikhail Zimyanin, Ivan Kapitonov, Yegor Ligachev, Konstantin Rusakov and Nikolay Ryzhkov.

People pass through the columned hall in an unending flow. Workers and employees of Moscow industrial plants, office workers, workers of the Moscow region, servicemen of the Soviet Army, party, government, trade union and Komsomol officials, workers in science and culture, representatives of public organisations, students and school-children have come here to bid farewell to Dmitriy Ustinov.

Along with the Soviet people, representatives of a number of communist and workers parties and military delegations from the fraternal countries of the socialist community and some other states are paying a tribute of deep respect to Dmitriy Ustinov.

1st Day Lying-in-State

LD221332 [Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1130 GMT on 22 December in the Novosti program carries an announcer-read report over video of Ustinov's lying-in-state.

The video report opens without the usual introductory music and shows the announcer in a dark suit and black tie repeating a previous announcement about the death of Marshal Ustinov.

The video shows the scene outside the House of Unions with lines of people filing into the building. The entrance is shown with a portrait of Ustinov with a large red and black drap hanging above it.

Then the interior of the Hall of Columns is seen looking down on the open coffin of Marshal Ustinov surrounded by flowers and cushions with medals. A closeup of the medals is shown and funeral music is played. The announcer describes the medals.

The video cuts to a medium shot of the hall showing people filing past the coffin. There is a closeup of the wreaths and ribbons from the CPSU Central Committee, Supreme Soviet Presidium, and Council of Ministers.

An aerial shot shows the coffin as "first watch of mourning" is taken by members of the governmental commission for the organization of the funeral.

Shown (left to right) are Chebrikov, Grishin, and Romanov standing at attention. The video then shows Bogolyubov and Smirnov. The announcer says the guard of honor is changed every 3 minutes. "It is 1200. Comrades Chernenko, Tikhonov, Gorbachev, and Gromyko form the guard of honor." Gromyko, Gorbachev, Tikhonov, and Chernenko are seen standing at attention beside the coffin. Chernenko glances briefly to his left toward the coffin.

Next, the video shows (left to right) Romanov, Grishin, Solomentsev, and Kunayev, followed by (left to right) Demichev, Ponomarev, Dolgikh, Kuznetsov, and Aliyev, and (left to right) Ligachev, Kapitonov, Chebrikov, Zimyanin, Ryzhkov.

The next lineup shows (left to right) Kuznetsov, Aliyev, Romanov, Chernenko, unidentified person slightly behind him, Tikhonov, Gorbachev talking to Gromyko, Grishin, Solomentsev, Kunayev. Members of Politburo are shown advancing to pay respects to Ustinov's family. In front to the right are Chernenko with his right arem supported by an unidentified man, and Romanov. Chernenko embraces and kisses a woman wearing glasses who appears to be Ustinov's widow. Behind him are Tikhonov, Gorbachev, Gromyko, Grishin, Solomentsev, Kunayev, Aliyev, Dolgikh, Ponomarev, and Demichev. The video shows a side view of Chernenko talking with the woman with an unidentified man and Romanov on his left. Marshal Sokolov is on the right in uniform. Chernenko embraces and kisses a balding gentleman and then a young woman approaches him. Other members of Ustinov's family are in attendance.

The video then shows an aerial view of people filing past coffin and then switches to Tikhonov, Gromyko, and Gorbachev expressing condolences, kissing, embracing, and shaking hands with members of Ustinov's family as other members of the Politburo stand behind them. Another aerial shot then cuts to show a row of unidentified people standing at attention with members of the public filing in behind them. The video then shows closeups of military men filing past with further shots of the public. Three unidentified military men are shown standing at attention, followed by more views of the public and military paying their last respects. The video shows a row of oriental-looking gentlemen, some in uniform, standing with their heads bowed.

The last video scene is an aerial shot of the coffin.

2d Day Lying-in-State

LD231523 [Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1318 GMT on 23 December in the Novosti newscast carries a 4.5-minute announcer-read report over video of Ustinov's lying-in-state.

The video report opens with a shot of the outside of the House of Unions where Ustinov's picture is mounted on the facade; a line of people standing outside the building are seen filing in and passing the coffin inside the hall.

The video then shows a long shot of what appear to be military men and two or three men in civilian dress standing in the guard of honor. Wreaths are shown being carried in by soldiers. A medium closeup then shows four unidentifiable men in civilian dress in the guard of honor, followed by shots of members of the public and military personnel filing past the coffin; a separate shot shows the display of Ustinov's medals. The video then shows three unidentified Army personnel leaving the guard of honor as the guard changes.

The next clip shows a lineup of 12 army officers: Third from right on the screen is Kurkotkin; fifth from right is possibly Ogarkov. After this more people are seen filing past the coffin, then a group of four Army officers and one civilian, all unidentified, standing in the guard of honor.

The video then shows four military men standing in the guard of honor, over which the announcer says: "A delegation of the command and staff of the Joint Armed Forces of the Warsaw Pact member-states honored the memory of the marshal of the Soviet Union." This is followed by further shots of the public filing past and more wreaths being brought in.

The next video clip shows six military men and one in civilian dress standing in the guard of honor, over which the announcer says: "A military delegation from a number of foreign countries paid a tribute of deep respect to Dmitriy Fedorovich Ustinov."

The closing scene shows a line of people filing in from the street.

Warsaw Pact Delegations Present

LD231553 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1400 GMT 23 Dec 84

[Text] The Soviet people received the news of the death of Dmitriy Fedorovich Ustinov, outstanding figure of the Communist Party and the Soviet state, with great sorrow. Today for the 2d day, thousands and thousands of Muscovites continue to move in an endless stream through the Hall of Columns of the House of Unions, where the coffin containing the body of the deceased is placed. They are paying a tribute of deep respect to the Communist-Leninist, ardent patriot and internationalist, outstanding military leader, whose whole life is an example of selfless service to the homeland and loyalty to communist ideals.

There are hundreds of wreaths at the base of the coffin, along the walls of the Hall of Columns and in the foyer of the House of Unions, among them, wreaths from the Kuybyshev Oblast party committee and the oblast executive committee. In the city on the Volga they remember Dmitriy Fedorovich well. He was born here into a worker's family and began his life's path.

Veterans of labor and war pass by and lay wreaths. They know Dmitriy Fedorovich Ustinov from prewar work as an engineer and designer, a deputy chief designer, and later a director of the Leningrad Bolshevik Works. During the war years, as a people's commissar of the USSR armaments, he headed the mastery and mass production of weaponry and did much for victory over Hitler's fascism and Japanese militarism.

In a column are generals, admirals, officers of the Soviet Armed Forces, students from military academies, and college students.

In the past of USSR minister of defense, Dmitriy Fedorovich Ustinov firmly and steadfastly implemented the policy of the party to ensure the defense capabilities of the Soviet state. His was a great service to raising the combat readiness of the army and fleet, to training and educating the personnel of the country's Armed Forces.

More and more wreaths are brought in from works and factories, scientific and research establishments, and military academies.

Dmitriy Fedorovich conducted great social-political work, was closely associated with labor and military collectives and party organizations.

A feeling for the new, creative approach to affairs was inherent in him, and the ability to organize people to resolve great and responsible tasks in strengthening the defense might of our homeland.

Representatives of military okrugs, groups of forces and fleets have come to honor the memory of the marshal of the Soviet Union. Funeral music can be heard. Every three minutes the guard of honor changes. A watch by the coffin is held by leaders of ministries and departments, military leaders, front-rankers from production, figures from science and culture, cosmonauts, representatives of party, and administrative and public organizations.

Dmitriy Fedorovich Ustinov actively strengthened combat cooperation between the Armed Forces of the USSR and the armies of participant states of the Warsaw Pact. A delegation of the command and headquarters of the united armed forces of participant states of the Warsaw Pact has come to honor his memory. Military delegations of a number of foreign countries have paid tributes of deep respect to the USSR minister of defense.

A minute of silence was observed to honor the memory of Dmitriy Fedorovich Ustinov by the members of military delegations from the members states of the Warsaw Pact: the People's Republic of Bulgaria, led by Army General Dzhurov, member of the Central Committee Politburo of the Bulgarian Communist Party; the Hungarian People's Republic, led by the Hungarian Defense Minister Colen General Olah; the GDR, led by Army General Hoffmann, member of the SED Politburo, and minister of national defense; the Polish People's Republic, led by Army General Siwicski, candidate member of the PZPR Central Committee Politburo; the Socialist Republic of Romania, led by Lieutenant General Olteanu, member of the Political Executive Committee of the Romanian Communist Party Central Committee and Romanian minister of national defense; and the CSSR, led by Colonel General Rusov, first deputy minister of national defense of the CSSR.

Other Delegations Present

LD231828 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 23 Dec 84

[Excerpt] Filing through the hall in mournful silence were the military delegations of: the DPRK, led by Army General O Chin-u, member of the Politburo of the Korean Workers' Party Central Committee and minister of the DPRK People's Armed Forces; of the Republic of Cuba, led by Division General Colome Ibarra, candidate member of the Politburo of the Communist Party of Cuba Central Committee and first deputy minister of the Revolutionary Armed Forces of the republic; of the Mongolian People's Republic, led by Lieutenant General Purevdorj, first deputy minister of defense of the Mongolian People's Republic and chief of General Staff of the Mongolian People's Army; of the SFRY, led by Colonel General Gracanin, chief of General Staff of the Yugoslav People's Army.

The memory of Dmitriy Fedorovich Ustinov was honored by military delegations of the Republic of Iraq, led by Colonel General Shanshal, minister of state for military affairs; and of the Syrian Arab Republic, led by General Tlas, first deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers and minister of defense.

A tribute of respect to the deceased was expressed by a Finnish Government delegation, led by Finnish Ambassador to the USSR Karhilo.

At 1800 access to the hall ceases. The family, loved ones, and friends of the deceased, and members of the government commission for organizing the funeral remain at Dmitriy Fedorovich Ustinov's coffin.

USSR Committees Send Condolences

LD221616 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1400 GMT 22 Dec 84

[Text] Telegrams and letters expressing profound condolences in connection with the demise of Dmitriy Fedorovich Ustinov, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee, USSR defense minister and marshal of the Soviet Union are reaching the CPSU Central Committee, USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, USSR Council of Ministers and USSR Defense Ministry.

Condolences were sent by:

The RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and the RSFSR Council of Ministers;

The Central Committees, the Presidiums of the Supreme Soviets and the Councils of Ministers of the Ukraine, Belorussia, Kazakhstan, Georgia, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia;

The Moscow Gorkom and the Moscow Gorispolkom;

The Moscow Obkom and the Moscow Oblispolkom;

The Leningrad Obkom and Gorkom, the oblast and city soviets of people's deputies;

The kraykom and executive committees of kray soviets of people's deputies;

CPSU obkoms and executive committees of kray soviets of people's deputies;

The All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions;

The Komsomol Central Committee;

Military councils of arms of the services troops and districts.

Letters and telegrams expressing condolences have also come from ministries and departments, from collectives of enterprises, building sites, collective and state farms, war and labor veterans.

Republics Send Condolences

LD231552 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0900 GMT 23 Dec 84

[Text] Telegrams and letters continue to arrive expressing deep condolences in connection with the death of Marshal of the Soviet Union Dmitriy Fedorovich Ustinov, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and USSR defense minister. The Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, the USSR Council of Ministers, the USSR Defense Ministry, and the Main Political Directorate of the Soviet Army and Navy.

Condolences have been sent by:

The Communist Party of Uzbekistan Central Committee and the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet and Council of Ministers of the Uzbek ASSR;

The Communist Party of Azerbaijan Central Committee and the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet and Council of Ministers of the Azerbaijan ASSR;

The Communist Party of Moldavia Central Committee and the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet and Council of Ministers of the Moldavian ASSR;

The Communist Party of Kirgizia Central Committee and the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet and Council of Ministers of the Kirgiz ASSR;

The Communist Party of Tajikistan Central Committee and the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet and Council of Ministers of the Tajik ASSR;

The Communist Party of Armenia Central Committee and the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet and Council of Ministers of the Armenian ASSR;

The Communist Party of Turkmenia Central Committee and the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet and Council of Ministers of the Turkmen ASSR;

The Military Council of the Southern Group of Forces;

The Military Council of the Red Banner Odessa Military Okrug;

The Military Council of the Red Banner North Caucasus Military Okrug;

The Central Committee of the USSR DOSAAF.

Letters and telegrams of condolence have also arrived from the personal of military units, ships and formations, military colleges, institutions of the USSR Defense Ministry, veterans of labor and of the Great Patriotic War, collectives of enterprises, construction sites, collectives and state farms; and from private individuals.

Funeral on 24 Dec

PM231647 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 24 Dec 84 First Edition p 2

["From the Government Commission Organizing the Funeral of Marshal of the Soviet Union D.F. Ustinov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR Defense Minister" -- PRAVDA headline"]

[Text] The Government Commission reports that D.F. Ustinov's body was cremated on the night of 23-24 December. The urn containing D.F. Ustinov's ashes has been placed in the Hall of Columns of the House of the Unions. Access to the Hall of Columns is open 24 December from 1100-1200 [0800-0900 GMT].

D.F. Ustinov's funeral will take place 24 December on Red Square by the Kremlin Wall at 1300 [1000 GMT].

Funeral Procession; Chernenko Absent

LD241015 [Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian at 0928 GMT on 24 December begins live coverage of the funeral of former defense minister, Marshal Dmitriy Ustinov. The burial urn is shown being carried from the House of Trade Unions and placed on a gun carriage pulled by an armored personnel carrier, which then moves off toward Red Square accompanied by an honor guard and followed by mourners.

At 0937 GMT, a video shows the funeral commission, military leaders, and representatives of friendly armies.

At 0942 GMT, a video shows the procession crossing Revolution Square. Shots alternate between showing the armored personnel carrier and gun carriage, the wreaths and medals, and the civilian and military groups in the funeral procession. Ustinov's widow, supported by two unidentified men, together with another female walk just behind the gun carriage.

At 0951 GMT, the funeral procession enters Red Square. At 0959 GMT, the funeral procession comes to a halt. The urn is shown being mounted on a pedestal in front of the Lenin Mausoleum and the armored personnel carrier and gun carriage move off. At 1000 GMT, Soviet leaders are shown in a long shot taking up their positions on the rostrum above the mausoleum. At 1001 GMT, Politburo member Grigoriy Romanov opens the funeral meeting.

At 1002 GMT, a video shows a medium shot of leaders on the rostrum. From left to right are seen Tikhonov, Romanov, Gromyko, Gorbachev, an unidentified man, and Solomentsev. Chernenko is not seen on the rostrum.

At 1014 GMT there is a pan shot of leaders on the rostrum. Several are unidentifiable because their coat lapels are turned up. Lineup shown is as follows (left to right): Romanov, Tikhonov, Gromyko, Gorbachev, Vorotnikov, Solomentsev, Kunayev, Aliyev, (?Dolgikh), Demichev, (?Kuznetsov), unidentified man, (?Rusakov), three unidentified men.

At 1025 GMT, another pan shot of people standing on the left side (as viewed on screen) is shown. Lineup shows (left to right): unidentified man, (?Bogolyubov), Smirtyukov, Akhromeyev, Bulgarian Defense Minister Dzhurov, Sokolov, two unidentified men, Grishin, Romanov, Tikhonov, Kudinov, Gromyko, Gorbachev, Vorotnikov, Solomentsev, Kunayev, Aliyev, (?Dolgikh), Demichev, (?Kuznetsov), unidentified man, (?Rusakov), three unidentified men.

At 1034 GMT, the announcer says that the funeral meeting is declared closed. The announcer says that Soviet leaders are descending from the rostrum. The camera switches to show an aerial shot of Red Square, then the procession moving off bearing the urn. The urn is carried by soldiers. Gromyko and Grishin are shown walking together on one side of the urn. Gorbachev and Tikhonov walk just behind the urn.

At 1039 GMT, the urn is placed in the niche in the Kremlin Wall. Soviet leaders are shown standing in a group by the wall and saluting. In the group are Gorbachev, Tikhonov, Gromyko, and Grishin standing at the front; others stand behind, obscured from view.

At 1040 GMT, the camera shows Ustinov's plaque, which now covers the niche, in the wall, shots of civilians standing beside the wall, Ustinov's medals displayed by his plaque, and the wreaths lined up along the wall.

At 1044 GMT, a march-past of military subunits on Red Square starts. At 1046 GMT, there is a medium shot of leaders on the rostrum of the Lenin Mausoleum again. Two soldiers are shown standing by Ustinov's plaque, which is next to that of Kostandov.

At 1047 GMT, there is another medium shot of leaders on the rostrum; some salute as the march-past continues. At 1048 GMT, there is a pan shot in medium closeup of leaders on the rostrum. Lineup shows (left to right): Akhromeyev, Dzhurov, Sokolov, unidentified man, Kudinov, Bogolyubov, Smirtyukov, unidentified man, (?Chebrikov), Romanov, Tikhonov, Gromyko, Gorbachev, (?Vorotnikov), Solomentsev, Kunayev, Aliyev, (?Dolgikh), two unidentified men, Demichev, four unidentified men, Ryzhkov. At 1051 GMT, the live relay ends while march-past continues.

CHERNENKO KOMMUNIST ARTICLE ON DEVELOPED SOCIALISM

LD221658 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0600 GMT 22 Dec 84

["Text" of an article by Konstintin Ustinovich Chernenko, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, under the rubric "Toward the 27th Party Congress," entitled "Up to the Level of the Demands of Developed Socialism: Some Current Problems of CPSU Theory, Strategy, and Tactics" (Na Uroven Trebovaniy Razvitogo Sotsializma) in the 18th issue of KOMMUNIST -- announcer-read]

[Text] It is one of the traditions of our Leninist party to give, at every major historical watershed, a brief yet capacious theoretical formula expressing the essential nature of the new stage we are entering upon, and the specific features of the new tasks; and to propose political slogans which enable us to combine the latest conclusions of revolutionary theory with the practical activity of the masses -- the ideas and will of the party with the thoughts and will of the millions. Today, our country stands at the beginning of the stage of developed socialism and the entry into this is the logical result of the intense creative activity of the party and people -- the outcome of the labor of decades, of which we are justly proud. At the same time, it is also the beginning of a great and complex turn toward resolving the tasks of perfecting the socialism that has been built in our country. It is the political, ideological-theoretical, and methodological approach to the fundamental questions of the further development of socialism and progress toward communism expressed in that deep formula that has formed the basis of work on the new edition of the CPSU Program which is to be discussed and adopted at the next, 27th party congress. The plans for the economic and social development of the country in the 12th 5-Year Plan and in the longer term will also be coordinated with the program's guidelines.

As it prepares for the congress, the party deems it necessary to give a comprehensive account of the meaning of the path we have traveled, and a precise scientific assessment of how things stand at the present time; to bring to the awareness of every Communist and every Soviet person the full novelty and complexity of the tasks arising from this; and to awaken the need to solve them creatively.

The foundation of the strategy and tactics of the CPSU in present-day conditions is provided by the Marxist-Leninist concept of developed socialism as a special and objectively necessary stage of the first phase of communist socioeconomic formation. Resulting as it does from a profound analysis of the experience of our party and of the other fraternal parties, and of world realities, it represents an outstanding contribution to the theory of scientific communism. Methodologically speaking, the heart of the concept of developed socialism, its living soul, is dialectical materialism -- the doctrine of development. It is the point of view of development that provides that key to understanding that concept, not as a collection of theses to be learned by rote, but as the system of views that is constantly being creatively enriched, an instrument for knowing and transforming socialist reality. That is the gist of the matter. It was the doctrine of development that enabled Marx and Engels to elaborate a scientific understanding of human history, to see in it an objective and naturally ordered process, each new stage of which does not arrive until the necessary material and spiritual prerequisites have come to fruition.

The idea of development forms the basis of the conclusion of Marx and Engels regarding the necessity for a socialist transformation of society, and of their doctrine of the two phases of a single communist formation. Lenin, too, proceeded from this in elaborating his theory of socialist revolution, of the transitional period, and of the logical ascent of socialism up the rungs of its socioeconomic maturity.

And today it is precisely from these positions, having generalized all that is in essence new in science and practice over recent decades, that the party has proposed a whole complex of ideas which enriched the contemporary theory of socialism. As I have already had occasion to remark, the main conclusion is that before resolving the tasks directly related to the building of communism, it is essential to pass through the historically lengthy stage of developed socialism. This conclusion is of fundamental importance to us both in the theoretical and political context. First, it makes it possible to give a scientifically based definition, with no suggestion of Utopia, of the level of socioeconomic maturity achieved by our society, and of the distinctive nature of the moment in time which we are experiencing; second, to define more precisely ideas about the content and duration of the socialist phase, and about the essential prerequisites for the transition to communism; third, to creatively renew on this basis the strategy and tactics of the CPSU, taking account of both the immediate future and the long-term communist perspective, to formulate specific tasks, and mobilize the masses to carry them out.

It is exceptionally important that this conclusion points us toward a realistic appraisal of both our great achievements and our existing shortcomings, an appraisal which neither exaggerates nor makes light of one or the other. Such an appraisal also commits us to appropriate practical action.

The strength of our theory lies in its veracity in accordance with the objective progress of events. This also applies in full measure to the methodology adopted for use by Communists, which Lenin with good reason defined as the revolutionary dialectic of Marxist realism. To regard reality in all its tangible variety, its multifaceted and contradictory nature, in constant motion and development from the lowest to the highest -- this is the principal precept of the dialectic, which lends particular perspicacity to both theory and politics. And we see that the reality of a society which entered the stage of developed socialism is a contradictory combination of major, truly historic successes in the building of socialism and general communist principles which have taken firm root in our life on the one hand, and on the other, of unresolved tasks of the present day, as well as problems inherited from yesterday, problems which in principle could have been resolved earlier, at the foregoing stages of our development.

Our country has advanced a long way within the framework of the first phase of communism. We have demonstrated in practice that the path of socialism is the path of truly radical resolution of contradictions which for centuries have been a source of constant social convulsions and shocks. Soviet society today is a system which has established itself on socialist social relations -- economically, politically, and ideologically binding together the working class, the collective-farm peasantry, the people's intelligentsia, and all the nationalities and ethnic groups of the country. The creation of such a system of relations opens broad opportunities, as was noted at the 26th CPSU Congress, to complete the reconstruction of all spheres of the life of society on the collectivist principles inherent in socialism.

Entering the stage of developed socialism is a great achievement for the Soviet people. It does not, however, signify that all socialist principles and norms are now being observed in all areas of our life, in every, so to speak, cell of the social organism, fully, consistently, and unswervingly. As is known, we have not yet achieved that.

Not all our problems and tasks have been resolved on the level of the demands of developed socialism. Here lies the common root of the multifarious problems toward which the thinking of the party and its Central Committee are turned today.

Indeed, take, for instance, the sphere of the economy. Its modern-day make-up is increasingly determined by associations and enterprises fitted with advanced equipment and technology and notable for rational organization, high labor productivity, and high economic efficiency of production. These are the areas of our national economy about which it may be said that, as a whole, they measure up to the requirements of developed socialism. They are the real shoots out of which the future will grow and which must multiply and grow stronger alongside the development of the scientific-technical revolution and scientific-production and agro-industrial integration, and alongside the dissemination of front-ranking experience throughout the national economic system.

At the same time, we have quite a number of enterprises which operate with already-outdated equipment and employ yesterday's technology. There are also enterprises where there is a preponderance of manual, low-skilled labor, which, as is known, millions of people in our country still perform. And that means that here, to use the language of dialectics, the material-technical and organizational sides of production are in a certain state of contradiction with its socialist socioeconomic nature, contradiction by public ownership. This is a real contradiction of the period we are living through, and to resolve it means bringing lagging sectors up to the level of the front-rankers, particularly such sectors of the economy as agriculture, construction, transport, and the services sphere; raising the efficiency of the national economy as a whole; and achieving a decisive breakthrough in the intensification of all its sectors. This was the task set by the party at the 26th CPSU congress and subsequent Central Committee plenums.

There are also certain differences in the level of socialist maturity and the degree to which socialism's high norms are realized and its vast potentialities utilized in some other areas of our life. It is, after all, no secret that examples of a conscientious attitude to labor and socialist property still coexist in our country with lack of discipline, bad management, and a desire by some people to secure their own prosperity at the expense of others and society by turning to their own advantage shortages of individual consumer goods and inadequacies in the system of supercision of the measure of labor and consumption. All this requires a serious improvement in the economic mechanism, perfecting distributive relations, further strengthening good order and discipline, and stepping up the effectiveness of ideological education work.

There are also difficult problems in the social sphere engendered by differences in the specific interests of different classes [klass] and groups of the population and by the necessity of harmonizing them in the best possible way. They also exist in the political sphere, where, as was noted at the April 1984 CPSU Central Committee Plenum, we have to surmount a certian discrepancy between the great wealth of possibilities of our democracy, and above all, the soviets, and its real practical utilization. They also exist in the sphere of the relations between nationalities, since the resolution of the nationalities question in the form in which we inherited it from capitalism signifies neither that it has been entirely removed from the agenda, nor that we have already succeeded in getting rid of the remnants of the past in people's psychology or of manifestations of narrow local interest or national narrow-mindedness.

It is the tackling of the whole set of great and complex problems relating by origin and character to various levels in the first phase of communism that constitutes the subject of multifaceted work which the party defines as the perfection of the socialism which has been built in our country. Evidently, some things will have to be not just finished off, but redone. Lenin did not rule out this possibility, pointing out that we shall more than once have to finish things off, redo them, and start afresh.

Reviewing today the road we have traveled and putting forward ideas which are innovative in their essence, we again and again turn to Lenin's inexhaustible legacy, finding in it layers of thought which give a creative spur to a deeper understanding of the past, present, and future. Reflecting in one of his last works on the distinctive features of our revolution, Lenin came to the conclusion that for all the conformity with the general laws of development throughout world history, individual periods of development constituting peculiarities in the form or order of this development, modifications of the ordinary historical order, are not in the least ruled out, but, quite the reverse, are presupposed.

By ordinary order he meant the achievement of such a level of development of productive forces and culture as is required for the creation of socialism. As Lenin noted, this level did not exist in the full sense in the old Russia. The victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution immediately made our country the most advanced one politically. According to Lenin's ideas the changes in the historical order consisted in the fact that the workers and peasants first of all gained power in order subsequently, on this basis, to overcome material and technical backwardness and to raise the country's productive forces to the highest world standards.

Some of our present problems and difficulties are directly and historically connected with the fact that, as yet, not all of the tasks engendered by these alterations in the normal order have been totally resolved. Their complete resolution will open up broad prospects for the revelation of the advantages of socialism in all spheres of social life and for the gradual transition to communism.

The perfecting of our society, of course, presupposes that today we must work better than yesterday, and tomorrow better than today. But by itself this is not enough. It does not just amount to celebrating the entry into the stage of developed socialism. It is more important to determine the very nature of the demands that are made by the new conditions, the specific guiding lines and aims precisely coordinated with the realities of the stage which has been achieved and calculated primarily for the foreseeabl future.

As a result of all of our preceding development, in the course of the vast creative work of the party and people to implement the decisions of the 26th CPSU Congress and the subsequent Central Committee plenums, we have reached such positions when we are able to and should move forward, taking as our guidelines the loftiest and most demanding concepts about socialism elaborated by scientific theory. Herein lies the essence of the deep qualitative changes which have matured in all spheres of the life of our society.

What then are the main guidelines by which we should lay our general course to perfect our socialist society? In posing the question in this way we distinctly acknowledge that one can talk of deepening and making more specific our concepts only within the limits of firmly established facts and fully formed tendencies. Acting in the spirit of the Marxist-Leninist behests, without any attempts at speculative construction of detailed forecasts, in recent years the party has enriched its theoretical and political arsenal with tenets allowing a clearer view of the general line of development and allowing the path to the future to be laid more precisely.

The party's efforts are directed primarily to completeing the intensification of the country's economy on the basis of a considerable acceleration of scientific-technical progress and of the all-round perfection and improvement of the forms and methods of socialist economic management. It is only in this way that the most advanced material and technical basis can be created which accords with the strict standards of developed socialism and that, consequently, the qualitatively new standard of welfare of the Soviet people can be ensured.

We shall in every way promote the deepening of the processes leading to the establishment of a classless socialist society, the further flourishing and drawing together of the nationalities, and seek to ensure that social relations everywhere be built in strict accordance with the principle of social justice inherent in socialism.

Our main signpost in developing the political system is the implementation in full of the socialist self-management of the people. We understand this as a democratic system of managing the affairs of society and of the state, operating in Lenin's words, not only for the working people, but through the working people. Naturally, this will demand a further growth of the role of the party, and a qualitative rise in the level of the party-political running of society.

It is impossible to achieve high targets in economic and sociopolitical development without relying on the profound knowledge, high awareness, and culture of the working people. At the same time, in the creation of new production, economic, social, and political conditions, must, in the final analysis, be directed toward ensuring the harmonious development of the individual. The all-round development of the personality has been and remains our highest aim. In this it is necessary only to remember that the degree of all-round development of each individual is determined by the degree of all-round development of all, and this depends on the level achieved of socioeconomic maturity of society, and its material and cultural opportunities.

The assimilation by all the working people of the truly innovative and profoundly creative conclusions and decisions of the party signifies in essence a reorientation of social awareness. The importance of the ideological-theoretical and propaganda work aimed at this is exceptionally great. In the development of the awareness of people, in linking the latest ideas of the scientific theory of socialism with the social creativity of the people, we are fully justified in seeing, as we have always done, the huge advantage of our system, a mighty source of the labor and social activity of the masses.

For this reason it is absolutely vital to form in every Soviet person a clear understanding of the scale and complexity of the tasks arising, and a readiness and the skill to fulfill them, working energetically, with initiative, and with maximum effect. At the same time, it must be constantly borne in mind that it is not merely a question of theoretically, so to speak, assimilating new ideas. It is vitally important to arrange matters so that all the work of the party, the administrative and economic organs, and the public organizations is structured with these ideas taken into consideration, everywhere and at all levels. In this lies the political meaning of the recent decisions on the fundamental questions of economic development of the CPSU Central Committee and the government.

From the same viewpoint the party Central Committee and the Central Committee Politburo have approached the pressing problems of the work of the soviets, the trade unions, the Komsomol, the people's control, and the creative unions.

From the foregoing it is clear that the perfection of developed socialism will comprise a whole historical epoch. This epoch will have its own specific stages, its own sequence of tasks, and its own time-scale. But it is essential to resolve urgent, top-priority problems today, immediately, laying down general, qualitative guidelines for the plans for the next 5-year period. All this will be reflected in the new edition of the CPSU Program. Making such amendments to it as are dictated by the spirit of political and scientific realism which has become established in the party, by the same token we define more precisely the prospect of reaching the frontiers of the actual building of communism.

Strictly distinguishing the stages, which are by nature different, and soberly studying the conditions in which they proceed, wrote Lenin, is by no means to postpone the ultimate aim indefinitely, by no means to slow one's progress prematurely.

We take this Leninist methodological principle fully into account. The founders of our doctrine saw communism not only as an ideal and as some sort of final state, but above all as real movement. The perfecting of developed socialism is actually that real progress toward communism. There is no other way to attain it. All haste, all running ahead, engendered by facile notions of that path, means, if we think about it, nothing else but the attempt to put off until tomorrow what can and must be done today. That is not Lenin's way, not the bolshevik way. After all, what most often lies behind the political blather that Lenin condemned is the intention, albeit from the best of motives, to count our present deficiencies and omissions as belonging to the natural accompaniments of socialism, of which we can rid ourselves only under full communism. That approach lowers the level of what we expect both of socialism and of communism, and blurs what Lenin called the vast difference between them. So what we are talking about is not a slowing down of our progress toward communism, but an acceleration; yet, it is a real, actual acceleration in which we set ourselves realistic objectives and employ real means to achieve them.

We have all we need to cope effectively with the new tasks. And, above all, we have behind us the advantage of the theses of a party that has a firm knowledge of where it is going, Lenin said.

When we point out that the process of perfecting advanced socialism is a multifaceted process, we are thereby drawing attention to the colossal amount of work that lies ahead of us. It would obviously be absurd to set an exact date for its completion: The time-scale here will be laid down by the results of the labor activity of the Soviet people. It will be determined, to a decisive degree, by what targets have been attained, and what heights scaled, in the national economy. Neither should it be forgotten that we are going to have to live and work in a world that is full of difficulties and contradictions. The economy demands prime attention in this connection also. In it is the material foundation of our defense might and of all our efforts directed toward providing for the security and peaceful working conditions of the Soviet people. The better the results of our economic activity at home, the more substantial will be the contribution we can make to economic cooperation with the fraternal socialist countries, and the more fruitful that cooperation will be for ourselves, for our allies, and for world socialism as a whole.

In general, in elaborating what you might call our global foreign-policy strategy, we are guided, and must always be guided, by the thought that it is by our economic successes that we exert our main influence upon international development and the course of world history. In a word, economic construction is our main policy, Lenin said.

The state of affairs in our economy, its achievements, problems, and difficulties, all this will, of course, be the subject of detailed discussion at the 27th party congress. The congress will generalize the results of the country's economic progress in the period under review, draw up the balance of what has been done and of what we have failed to complete; it will set the tasks of the development of the national economy in the following 5-year period and up to the end of the century. And here, many economic questions, including major ones of fundamental importance, will, on this occasion, be on the agenda of the congress, not only because time has brought us to the milestone in the calendar that divides one 5-year plan from another.

Our economy itself has come right up to the frontier at which qualitative changes and transformations in it have become an imperative necessity, as it is called. Consequently, party preparations for the congress include preparations for giving a profound analysis both of the essence of the changes which have come to a head in the national economy and of the imminent and long-term prospects which they have opened up.

Today, the whole form of our thoughts and actions connected with the economy should be determined by the concept of developed socialism and should correspond to the demands included in it for realism. What does this mean? It is extremely important to have a realistic approach to the question of what can and cannot be provided by the economy within the framework of the first phase of communist formation. It is impermissible to orientate it toward unattainable even if attractive aims. For such a departure from Marxist-Leninist science and from life or, in other words, for such voluntarism retribution is inevitable. But it is also impermissible to go to the other extreme, that is to underestimate in any way the possibilities of the socialist economy and to set it tasks on the basis of lowered conceptions of its creative strength. This also an unsuitable position unworthy of Marxist-Leninists and alien to the very revolutionary spirit of the socialist society.

In our economic affairs there should be no place for a narrow overemphasis on practical matters which shuts itself in on daily current concerns and fears great ideas and aims, for it is no secret that, at times, the attention of certain comrades working in the national economy is totally absorbed by immediate, private problems. It is doubly bad when the attempt is made to justify an approach to the economy, an approach suffering from a lack of broad and bold views by referring to a misconceived demands for realism. One must not close one's eyes to the difficulties and complications, they say, and today we have so many, they say, that it would be better not to draw great plans for tomorrow. It is not inapt to recall how Lenin reacted to such realism, if one can call it that. When great plans appear which are calculated for a period of many years there are frequently skeptics who say: What is the point of calculating for many years ahead? For heaven's sake let us do what is needed now. It is necessary to know how to combine both. It is not possible to work without a plan calculated for a long period and for important successes.

Such a precisely Leninist approach to matters should serve as a model of genuine realism in economic work. Temperance in essentially economic calculations is organically combined with broad political vision, with the ability to generalize and express the main things which shape both the current reality and the future of the Soviet economy. From this it follows that our plans and economic practice should be given not simply an economic foundation but primarily a political economic one. In other words, they should be based on the knowledge and all-round use of the objective laws of the development of the socialist economy. For, if one does not take them into account one cannot talk of realism.

The documents of the party congresses and Central Committee plenums contain the conclusion that at the stage of developed socialism it becomes an objective social demand to make the transition to intensive methods of economic management and to a sharp raising of the efficiency of production. It is precisely the political-economic essence of this conclusion which is important. If it remains not understood then, as experience shows, the theoretically deep and true idea to a great extent loses its mobilizing and guiding significance for practice. Indeed, what is it that urges us toward intensification of production? Or, in other words, toward seeking to obtain a greater yield of output with a smaller expenditure of material resources and with a smaller number of workers? One reply which is correct in its own way, but which is still inadequate and is lacking in political-economic depth, states that in recent times we have been made more aware of the limited nature of material and human resources that can be brought into production. Yes, there is something of a shortage of resources, but let us ask ourselves: If, on the contrary, raw materials, fuel, and other materials and workers existed in any required amounts, would it be permissible now to manage the economy using the methods, wasteful according to modern notions, which are characteristic of an extensive economy? Incidentally, this is by no means an abstract question.

We have not had and do not have now a shortage of many types of resources. Nevertheless, it is inadmissible today to use them without keeping the strictest tally of their utilization and without the active manifestation at every step of a concern for husbanding them. It is inadmissible because the very successes of the Soviet economy have imposed a limit on its extensive development. The need for intensification is dictated not merely, and even not so much, by a shortage of resources, but above all by the fact that our national economy has already achieved a level of production at which, in order to make headway, it is necessary not so much to expand it as to renew it.

When organizing and channeling the national economic process, one must not, under any circumstances, be guided by the objective of producing the same things, but merely in greater quantity. Of course, we still have a shortage of some types of output. For some time to come, a large amount of our efforts and resources will continue to be directed at the elimination of all sorts of shortages and disproportions, at the opening up of bottlenecks. There is nothing you can do about this. But it is important to realize that while taking measures to resolve these problems as rapidly as possible, it is essential to shift most of one's attention to the attainment of a qualitative change for the better in the whole national economy. One must be able to see clearly that the country's further economic progress depends to a decisive degree on how all available resources are utilized and on our ability to put into play the enormous creative forces which are inherent in the very nature of the economy of developed socialism.

These forces are such that today they enable us, or, to be precise, they even oblige us, to set ourselves a major task of programmatic significance: that of ensuring that the country attains the highest world level of public-sector labor productivity. The advancement of this task is well founded politically, socially, and economically.

First, since we are striving to bring all aspects of the life of Soviet society fully into line with the highest scientific notions of socialism, the issue of labor productivity assumes the same fundamental significance as was attached to it by Lenin. It was, as one knows, the attainment of the highest labor productivity that he regarded as the most important and fundamental factor for the final and complete triumph of the new economic and social structure. And by its significance and content, the process of perfecting developed socialism presupposes that this task which Lenin formulated must be transferred to the plane of practical implementation.

Second, if the further development of our society is seen as a movement toward the full realization of the socialist ideal, then this very fact imposes an obligatory social guideline for this development -- raising the prosperity of the people to the highest level. This can only be achieved on the basis of raising labor productivity. Its highest level is, in a socialist society, both a necessary and sufficient condition for ensuring a similar level for the standard of living of the working people.

Third, the course toward achieving first place in the world in the sphere of labor productivity corresponds to our present economic opportunities. The unified multi-industry national-economic complex which has been established in the USSR possesses a mighty production-technology potential. In output of many types of product our country is confidently in the lead and has no equal in the world. Where the productivity of public-sector labor is directly concerned, in its rate of growth the Soviet Union is ahead of the leading capitalist states; although there is still a gap -- a considerable one -- between the Soviet economy and highly developed capitalism in this key indicator, it is within our power to overcome it and break into the lead.

It would be incorrect to calculate that we shall be able to cover the whole distance remaining between us and this goal rapidly, but, great and complex though the task may be, there are no grounds whatever for postponing its completion beyond the bounds of the foreseeable future. For this reason it should remain in our minds and literally stand before our eyes even today. Our plans and specific economic decisions must accord with it.

The immediate tasks of the Soviet economy should also be considered from the same standpoint. The point at present is that before the end of the eighties it is vital that we achieve a fundamental watershed in raising the efficiency of the national economy, in the intensification of all branches of it. The objective prerequisites for such a watershed are present. All our economic work must now be directed decisively toward implementing it.

The first and most obvious thing which must be done is to mobilize the organizational efforts and material means essential for the swiftest possible technical reequipping of all branches of the national economy, and for the rapid production assimilation of the most progressive technologies.

This is a task of key importance. To resolve it is to resolve the problem of intensification, of raising the efficiency of the economy as well. It is natural that questions of economic and production exploitation of the immense scientific-technical potential of our country, questions of its further development and buildup, are now at the focus of attention of the party. It is planned that they will be given all-round, detailed consideration at the next CPSU Central Committee plenum.

The result we wish to obtain from work to introduce the latest equipment and technology into production is correctly defined as a qualitative transformation of productive forces. At the same time, there exists the truth well known to all Marxists: that the development of productive forces inevitably has a definite social form, molded by production relations. We never forget this truth, and we must not forget it, particularly since life and our own experience give constant reminders of it. They give positive reminders, so to speak, when the new economic forms introduced within the framework of economic experiments immediately and tangibly promose a renewal of the production apparatus and a substantial upsurge in labor productivity. They also give negative reminders in cases where forms and methods of management which have become established and have justified themselves in the past become obstacles in the way of new equipment, keeping it out of the workshop.

This points to only one conclusion: The level of results of all our concerns over the qualitative transformation of productive forces depends directly upon whether we are able to introduce the appropriate changes in production relations. People know the initiatives that the party has come out with and the measures that it has taken in order to give development to the process of perfecting production relations. This includes the active dissemination of the brigade contract method: the organizing of agro-industrial complexes; ever-deeper introduction of financial autonomy; and those major innovations, though as yet tentative, that are destined to establish firmly at all levels of economic and production activity two inseparably interconnected elements, greater independence and greater responsibility.

The extraordinary importance of this work is, on the whole, determined by the fact that it is calculated to create the economic conditions without which the orientation toward the technical reequipping of the national economy, and toward its intensification, could, to put it bluntly, hang in midair. Highly productive technology, multiplied by universal economic interest in its application, is really the only thing that can make the imminent economic breakthrough into a reality, uniting the two revolutions -- the scientific-technical and the social -- and revealing with new force the advantages of socialist organization of production. The chief of those advantages as Lenin taught, is that socialism opens up to the toiling masses the possibility of working for themselves using all the gains of the latest technology and culture.

The history of our country shows what great and unparalleled labor achievements a people is capable of when it is conscious of working for its own benefit, in its own interests. It is of special importance to us now to strengthen and develop that awareness. Why now, especially? Because the intensification of production is simply impossible without an interested, enterprising, and creative attitude to the task at hand on the part of every worker, literally at every workplace. And here we cannot rely merely upon a general understanding that with us, all work serves to increase the public wealth, and ultimately enhances the prosperity of all the working people. We must be thorough in seeing to it that all socially useful work is more directly and tangibly felt by those who perform it as work that they are doing for themselves. The question of giving the workers a greater interest in their own labor is the question of perfecting our system of material and moral incentives, and of distributive relations generally. The task that is being put in the forefront here is that of making sure that wages are strictly dependent on the results of labor, its productivity, and conditions. We cannot allow wage increases to get ahead of the increase of labor productivity, yet this is something that regrettably still occurs and, as has been repeatedly noted in party documents, has a negative effect on the economy and the prosperity of the people. But we also incur appreciable losses from a practice that is the opposite of this: That is, when people achieve clearly better results in their economic activity, but receive no substantial reward for it. Who can count how many workers have had their ardor dampened, how much labor enthusiasm has been extinguished, and what losses has our national economy suffered as a result?

Not a little has recently been done to increase the stimulating effort of the organization of labor and the forms of payment. Considerable experience has been amassed in this respect in the frontranking financially autonomous brigades and at many of the enterprises working in the conditions of the economic experiment. Measures are being taken which make it possible to forge a closer link between work and payment, not only in industry and agriculture, but also in the service sphere and in management. On the whole, however, it has to be admitted that, though we are moving in the right direction, we are moving too slowly.

It would seem that in some of our departments, there is insufficient awareness as yet of what practical conclusions should be drawn, in present conditions, from Lenin's behest that distribution is a method, a tool, a means of increasing production.

In interpreting the experience of decades of socialist construction, the party drew, at the 26th congress, the exceedingly important conclusion that the interconnection between the economic and social progress of the country must be intensified. The same idea is expressed in our now oft-repeated formula that in order to live better, we must work better.

These are simple words and their meaning is clear to everyone, and yet it does no harm to take a more detailed look at what they signify and what obligations they entail. Above all, of course, the point is that good work, better work, should yield earning benefits, and, conversely, anyone who works badly must be prepared to accept not a better life, and not even the same life as before, but a worse life. We are trying to ensure that everyone is fully accountable for his work. After all, it cannot ultimately be tolerated that people should be paid for defective products, for making goods which they themselves, in the role of shoppers, would spurn. That is one point. Secondly, what does live better mean? This idea is at times interpreted in a very one-sided manner, which makes it entirely a question of getting more pay and a higher income and achieving a higher level of consumption.

There is no denying it: The material side of the question is very important and it is inadmissible to neglect it to any extent, but surely that is not the sum total of people's lives, particularly in our socialist state? There are, in fact, a myriad spiritual, moral, and psychological values which Soviet people cherish no less, if not more, than material benefits. Has your job become more interesting, has the respect in which you are held in the collective grown, is there a good, comradely atmosphere at your enterprise? Those are just a few factors chosen at random which, taken together add up to something of what it means to live better. And to this, of course, one can and must add the myrdiad other successes, achievements, and joys, which everyone strives for in their personal lives and which we are all working toward together in the larger, common life of our society.

The fundamental rule, however, still remains in force: To live better in this broad sense as well, it is necessary to work better. And that is not just because the only source of the material means for a better life is the sphere of labor and production, but also, and this is the main point, because in this sphere the creative activity of Soviet people unfolds every day, their personal qualities are disclosed and tested and their social interests and norms of conduct shaped. The nature of their relations in factory workshops, stock-farms, and institutions and their attitudes to each other and to the work at hand, which are formed here, are what ultimately determines the whole make-up and quality of our lives.

If you think about it, this gives rise to a converse and no less true formula: To work better, you must live better. Indeed, when, for instance, in a production collective, life is going well, when an atmosphere of friendship and mutual support reigns, the work also goes well. The same thing happens on the scale of society as a whole. We note with satisfaction that in recent years things have gone better in our national economy. It has proved possible to surmount a number of negative tendencies which arose at an earlier period. Everyone knows that measures adopted on the initiative of the CPSU Central Committee with the aim of introducing good order, raising the level of organization, and strengthening discipline in production at all levels of management and, in general, in all areas of our life and activity, have helped to achieve this.

This has produced a tangible positive effect in itself, but, in addition the fact that people's mood was raised has also had a part to play. The Soviet people immediately reached the proper conclusion that more order means a better life, and this has inspired them to fresh labor efforts and better work, the results of which enable one today to count on a successful conclusion to the 5-year plan period.

Nor should one omit to mention the great significance in this context of the struggle we have mounted against misappropriators of public wealth, bribe-takers, and speculators. It would seem that there is no direct connection between these decisive measures adopted by party and state bodies and improvements in the production indicators in the economy. But such a connection exists, and it is quite tangible.

For when society is able graphically to express not in words but in actions its irreconcilability toward incomes not derived from labor, at the same time it stimulates socially and encourages morally conscientious labor. It is here, indeed, that the issue of social justice inherent in our society arises; in our country the exploitation of man by man has been eliminated. All members of society have been ensured in real terms an indentical relationship toward the means of production. All, irrespective of sex and the nationality to which they belong, have been given equal rights to labor, recreation, housing, to free medical services and education, to provision in old age. The social policy of the party and state is constantly directed toward raising the level of the people's well-being, toward strengthening the health of all Soviet people, toward extending the housing stock, and toward developing and further improving the systems of general and vocational education. All this guarantees a high degree of equality which is achievable only under conditions of socialism.

However, this is only one side of our social justice. There is another one, too, which is expressed precisely in the basic principle of socialism — from each according to his abilities, to each according to his labor. And to the extent that we are striving to raise the whole of our life up to the level of the highest requirements of socialism, to that extent we are obliged to ensure that this principle is applied in practice in the most consistent way. No one in our country casts doubt nor can cast doubt upon the fact that payment and the distribution of wealth according to one's labor is the most just of causes. Conversely, if departures from this take place, if the notorious practice of leveling-off flourishes, then this naturally disturbs the conscience and is taken as injustice.

In this connection, it should be stressed particularly that a system for providing material incentrives for labor which has been set up correctly provides benefits not just in the production sense; it also exerts a beneficial moral influence upon the labor collectives, upon society, that is to say, if one looks at the essence of the matter, upon the person. And this is very important, for in our country, to use the words of Marx, the person is the end-purpose of production. The requirements and the interests of the working person serve as the social landmark of our economic progress and social progress as a whole.

Among other things, this presupposes that the consistent implementation of the basic principle of socialism refers not just to its second part -- to each according to his labor: it is essential that constant concern be shown to ensure that people of labor have the conditions to reveal and apply their abilities. This, too, is a requirement of socialist justice.

The main and essentially inexhaustible reserve for the acceleration of the country's economic development that is now necessary lies in people who work in an interested and purposeful way.

And it is quite natural that over the past few years, when the volume of our party's economic work has increased and when its content has been enriched, attention in this work to what one is accustomed to call the human factor of production has grown substantially. The CPSU proceeds from the fact that, for the party, being engaged with the economy means first and foremost getting engaged with the people who run the economy. Political methods for economic affairs: that, in essence, is the formula for the party leadership of the economy.

The June 1983 Central Committee Plenum furnished a lot for the understanding of this piece of truth. Having examined matters pertaining to the ideological and mass political activity of the party, it adopted decisions which were important also from the point of view of the economy in so far as the fundamental aim is to set in motion the big creative forces embedded in the consciousness and ideological conviction of the masses.

The Soviet people inseparably link up the successes achieved by our people in the revolutionary struggle and in socialist creation with Lenin's party. It has earned its leading position in society through its selfless struggle for the ideals of scientific socialism, for the interests of the working class and of all working people. And it has been recognized by the people itself as being the vanguard force of society. The whole practice of world socialism convincingly testifies to the fact that the creation and successful functioning of a new social system is possible only under the guiding activity of the Communist Party. At every fresh historical stage -- this is also borne out by the experience of the work that has already been done on perfecting developed socialism -- the leading role of the party increases. This fits in objectively with the natural run of things.

The thesis that it is necessary to narrow down the sphere of party leadership is zealously inflated in the camp of the improvers of socialism, of whom there have been more than enough at all times among the ideologists of the bourgeoisie and revisionists. It is suggested that either the economy be excluded from this sphere or issues pertaining to social or political development.

From the fundamental point of view, attempts to restrict the range of the guiding influence of the party by whatever sphere are untenable if only for the reason that the interests of the working class and all working people which the party expresses cannot be reduced either to purely economic or purely social or ideological ones. They permeate the whole of public life and the party, it stands to reason, cannot ignore this.

The need to embrace with party influence precisely all facets of the life of society increases even more at the stage when socialism, entering the period of its maturity, acquires the characteristics of an integral system and the correlation and interdependence of economic, sociopolitical, and spritual factors becomes tighter than ever before.

Our party sees the way to increasing the effectiveness of leading society not in the narrowing down of its sphere, but in improving the methods of leading. These are methods of influencing politically the development of the economy, social relations, democracy, and culture, and methods of convincing, organizing, and educating the masses.

It is through the formulation of key directions for economic and social policy, through the organization of the monitoring of its implementation, and through the cadres and Communists active at all levels of socialist construction, that the party exercises its leading role.

Our political system has been, and remains, a tried and tested mechanism by which the party and the Soviet people are welded into a single whole. The party has a vital interest in ensuring that it gives wide expression to the interests of all classes and social groups of our society, opens up still greater scope for independent activity and initiative by the people, and works toward the lofty aim of seeing that everyone plays a direct part in running the affairs of the state and of society.

Socialism realizes its advantages through democracy. The increasing of the party's leading role and the deepening of socialist democracy are a single, integral, natural process. The party will continue to conduct a broad quest for new and still more effective means of implementing the power of the people, and will go on striving to ensure that better use is made of those forms of it that have been tested in practice. Today, the center of gravity of this work is being transferred onto the full and consistent realization of the extensive rights with which the soviets, labor collectives, and all levels of our democratic system have been endowed. Thus, and only thus, can we embrace the whole spectrum of tasks confronting society, take into account the particularity of the interests of all classes and strata of the population,and place on a better footing the system of the party's vital ties with the masses.

A task of first importance today is improving the work of every link in the political system and cleansing it of bureaucratic, parochial, and departmental accretions which slow down the initiative of the masses. It is not less important to achieve both a more precise democration of the functions of the soviets, trade unions, Komsomol, and other public organizations, and closer interaction among them under the guidance of the party. Here a kind of law of economy of resources must operate also, to enable us to obtain with the minimum of expenditure the greatest and most lasting results.

A matter that merits special discussion is the work of the state apparatus and the improvement of the organs of administration. This question has been raised more than once, and quite a lot has been done. But, by and large, progress so far has been slow, and not least because some comrades are taking a simplistic view and trying, for instance, to solve the problem of reducing the size of the apparatus mechanically, while leaving the existing structure of administration unchanged. This approach does not, and cannot, produce the desired effect. Staffs reduced in this way quickly return to normal, or even grow. Reduction of the apparatus must be the result of painstaking work on its rationalization. What is involved is the elimination of superfluous levels which give rise to bureaucratic red tape, and the inprovement of the organization of managerial work and the provision of better technical facilities for it. What seems to be needed is a concept on the basis of which one can work out the optimal structure for each organ of administration. It may even be that, to achieve this, some new levels may have to be set up; but the general outcome must necessrily be reduction.

However good the apparatus, each manager must constantly seek out meetings and direct contacts with the mass of the party, the working people. As we know, members of the Politburo and secretaries of the CPSU Central Committee do systematically hold such meetings, and they are very productive. Our system of party information also works, on the whole, quite well, enabling us to pick up sensitively the mood of the people and study their opinions and suggestions. At the same time, in a number of cases, local party organs, and the leaders of departments and institutions, either do not, have sufficient information about negative phenomena,or simply shrug it off, and do not take the necessary measures to bring about a healthier situation. This has happened in Uzbekistan, Rostov Oblast, and Krasnodar Kray. In these places, as you know, it has been necessary to take strong action to put matters right, and not, unfortunately, on the initiative of the local party organizations. There, the barometer of public opinion long ago moved out of the fair mark.

A reliable path in the strengthening of the leading role of the party is the consistent observance of Leninist norms and principles, of the Leninist style in the work of party committees, state and economic organs, and of the public organizations. They have been tested by decades of struggle and creation, and remain the most important signposts in perfecting our work.

It is hardly necessary to say that the universal introduction of these principles is possible precisely because they express the character of the party and the nature of our system and socialist state.

Of course, an example must be set here by the party and above all by its organization of intraparty work, by the maturity of intraparty relations, and by the very style of party leadership. Broad discussion of party decisions, fundamental criticism and self-criticism, openness in the work of all the ruling organs of the party, energetic participation by the entire party mass in drafting and discussion of policy, and strict discipline in implementing the decisions adopted -- such are the distinguishing features of the intraparty life of the CPSU.

Of first-ranking importance to us Communists is, of course, the well-tried principles of democratic centralism. In the CPSU it is recognized by all, and there is no need to prove its enduring significance. The Central Committee devotes constant attention, on the one hand, to developing and deepening democratism in our party at all levels, and on the other, to strengthening centralism, good organization, and unity in the implementation of the decisions adopted. Belittling either of these two interlinked principles of democratism or centralism is fraught with serious error.

In the year of the coming party congress it is exceptionally important to study attentively all that is new and interesting which has appeared recently in the work of the party organizations, without, of course, leaving the shortcomings unexposed. We may note with satisfaction that in the work of a number of republican party committees, kraykoms, and obkoms a creative stream has begun to show itself increasingly clearly. An experiment on a broad front in various sectors of management of the economy, science, and culture, is being carried out by the central committees of the Communist Parties of the Ukraine, Belorussian, Georgia, and Lithuania, and by the Moscow Obkom, Krasnoyarsk Kraykom, and Sverdlovsk Obkom. Broad preliminary discussion in primary party organizations of major problems being submitted at plenums and party committee bureaus, and at party congresses and conferences, are becoming the rule.

Recently, the CPSU Central Committee approved the experience of the Leningrad Obkom, which drafted a territorial-industry program for intensification of the economy on the basis of speeding up the introduction into the national economy of the achievements of science and technology. Apart from anything else, the value of this experience lies in the fact that it suggests one of the ways of managing socioeconomic processes at the territorial level, where many unresolved questions still remain.

Of course, no two initiatives are the same. The Central Committee will continue to do all it can to encourage the initiative of local party committees in the resolution of problems related to the rational utilization of labor, raw material, and power resources, and in meeting the needs of the population for consumer goods and domestic services. But at times one thing puts one on one's guard: One sometimes sees how the energy of some managers is devoted to a considerable extent to the construction of prestige projects rather than useful ones, and these are being built on so-called noncentralized sources of finance.

But in acutal fact it turns out that resources are being diverted from plan objectives: The periods for the assimilation of capital investments are dragged out and the state bears the direct loss. We will fight resolutely against initiatives of that kind. Persistently improving the style of their activity, the party committees are called upon to exert an active influence upon the style of the work of state and economic organs, too; to exert an influence, first and foremost, through arranging their own work in an exemplary way and through raising exactingness.

It is essential to harden particularly the price demanded for slackness and violations of executive discipline. Without the strictest discipline the most wonderful decisions and intentions will remain no more than good desires. At the same time, discipline, as we understand it, is certainly not some kind of opposite to democracy. On the contrary, it makes it possible to realize in practice the interests of the majority and the will of the party and the people. Without discipline and a firm social order democracy remains merely a fine phrase, but of course discipline must not fetter initiative. The struggle for a precise organization of the matter at hand must not become transformed into overorganization.

At the 27th congress we are to discuss the issue of changes in the CPSU statute. The statute is the law of the party's life: Figuratively speaking, it is our party consittution. And the proposals being received from party organizations and the experience of the communist parties of the fraternal socialist countries must be studied with complete attention. In a word, work must be done on the statute in a thoughtful and creative way. This, without doubt, will serve the further consolidation of the democratic foundations of the party, the strengthening of a discipline that is strict and common for all Communists, the growth of their activity and initiative, and the further improvement of relations within the party.

Nor is the report-back and election campaign very far away. In this connection, I think, it is pertinent to raise once again the issue of the character of our meetings and conferences. An atmosphere of creative search, of efficiency, of adherence to principle, of a self-critical approach to the evaluation of one's own work must reign at meetings. For this Communists must take up arms resolutely against formalism. For example, we are accustomed to calling the discussion of report-back plans and decisions a debate, but do the content and tone of the discussion always correspond to the true meaning of the word? Reports frequently merely set out impassively absolutely incontrovertible truisms, alternating with figures, together with, let us be frank, a large portion of glorification addressed to the higher leadership. Is it surprising when Communists respond to this not with criticism and self-criticism, not with a businesslike discussion of the problems, but with standard approvals and cheerless accounts of one's own performance. But freedom of discussion and criticism, one of the essential norms of party, presupposes the comparison of different views on a concrete issue. It is precisely this kind of approach that encourages a lively and fruitful discussion of topical problems.

In antiquity they used to say that if different views were not expressed, then there is nothing from which the best may be chosen. Real, and not ostentatious, unanimity is achieved, as a rule, after a question has been pondered deeply and interpreted collectively from all sides. In a word, we are in favor of comradely discussions and arguments, but arguments, of course, that are sensible and businesslike, and which are crowned in sensible suggestions.

Fromalism is a tenacious, manysided creature, and one of its manifestations is the generation of paper.

The impression is created that some establishments evaluate their work not according to the actual state of affairs in the sector within their jurisdiction, but according to the number of resolutions, decisions, and instructions of all kinds that have been issued. Nor have methods of leadership by means of large numbers of commissions and conferences, each involving large numbers of people, which merely consume time, been excluded everywhere. How can one fail here to recall the observation of Lenin upon the poem by Mayakovskiy about those who have spent too long in conference' It is enough to take a look at us, how we sit in meetings and work in committees, to say that the old Oblomov has remained and it is necessary to wash, clean, pull about, and thrash him for a long time so that some sort of sense comes out.

Policy is conducted through people. This Leninist tenet is of fundamental importance for the work of the party with cadres. The extent to which labor collectives and all links of the country's national economic complex work in a precise, coordinated and intense manner depends on cadres, and above all on party cadres. The party considers cadre policy to be an effective instrument for exerting active influence on the development of all spheres of Soviet society and an important factor of its progress.

However, life does not stand still. It presents new demands. Now, when the need has become ripe for profound qualitative changes in all speres of society the problem of cadres has acquired a particular resonance. This is why the Central Committee raises the question not simply of improving work with cadres, but of cadre policy at the present-day stage. And this means that changes in keeping with modern conditions in the whole system of selecting, training, and promoting cadres and checks on their activity are necessary.

It stands to reason that the point is not that some sort of special campaign be carried out or that there be a shake-up of cadres. What is needed is calm and thoughtful work aimed at the future. At the same time in cadre policy there is also quite a lot of, to put it bluntly, sore matters which require not talk but urgent practical resolution. It is necessary to wage even more resolutely the struggle against all kinds of abuse of official positions, against manifestations of protectionism and forming regional cliques. And here the Central Committee will not tolerate any indulgences, for this matter is a political one, a matter of the prestige of the party and trust of the masses.

The main thing, it stands to reason, is not the harshness of punishments, although the Central Committee -- and this is well known -- takes severe measures when necessary. The main thing is to create an atmosphere in which the slightest deviation from the norms of party ethics, the slightest violation of socialist legality, will immediately receive the fitting assessment of both the party masses and also of higher bodies. For this we need to develop on an even broader scale principled criticism, resolutely cut short all attempts to suppress it, and even more so, cut short persecution because of it.

It is apt to remind those who suffer from excessive self-importance and have not been trained to listen to opposite points of view of one of Lenin's thoughts: It is necessary not to see either intrigue or a counterweight in persons who think differently or who approach things differently, but to value independent people: to value them not according to the services they render but according to their merits. In work with cadres it is necessary to develop in every possible way democratic principles and extend the practice of appointment by election and competitions for the appointment of posts and of systematic public reporting back to working people. It is necessary that the primary party organization in which this or that leader ranging from foreman to minister finds himself should be in the know when he receives not only lofty awards but also party penalties.

The constant influx of fresh forces and the skillful combination of experienced cadres of the older generations with young promising workers is also necessary.

Particularly as regards economic cadres, supreme adherence to party and ideological principles, competence and responsibility, and the skill to work together with people is required of them today in the same way as it is of all leaders. But this is not enough. The skill to think in economically literate and modern terms and to strive for effectiveness and intensive factors of growth is necessary. It is necessary to get right away from the stereocyped ways of thinking that have come about under which the quantitative, gross figures approach has clearly predominated over the qualitative. One would like to issue a warning against a dangerous misconception: Certain party committees, proceeding from the generally corect assumption that the state of affairs in some area of work depends, to a decisive degree, on those in charge of it, start convulsively changing, one after another, their farm chairmen or factory directors, for example, without bothering to give them businesslike, concrete help. It goes without saying that this practice does no good.

To the CPSU, any kind of arrogance inspired by its position as the vanguard is fundamentally alien. On the contrary, it does everything to raise all the working people to the level of the vanguard by virtue of their awareness, their understanding of the laws of social development and of modern politics, by their social activeness. And here, there is an enormous role for ideological work, for taking socialist consciousness to the masses. By its very nature, this is a profoundly democratic and humane task.

Unless the working people have a sound grasp of the ideology and morality of the working class and a deep understanding of the policy of the CPSU, it is inconceivable that society should be strongly united ideologically, politically, and socially, or that the people should rally closely around the party. Only on the basis of a lofty idea, expressing the prospect of social development and the fundamental interests of the people, can true orderliness and intelligent discipline be achieved both in the party and in society.

Of course, the tasks of ideological educative work are not confined to the dissemination of scientific ideology and the organizing of profound study of it on a massive scale. This work is an effective tool for operatively, systematically, comprehensively, and convincingly informing the masses regarding current questions of our policy. It can be said to be a wide window onto a complex, troubled, and constantly changing world. We also take into account the enormous role of propaganda as a means of obtaining feed-back from the masses. The broad and free expression of people's opinions in the pages of the press; detailed and extensive discussion of decisions which are being made, and business-like criticism from below, workers' letters, all this is, at it were, a reliable mechanism of insurance against voluntarism and subjectivism in politics, making it possible to select optimal solutions and to make, in good time, such changes to them as are prompted by life itself.

Le me note particularly the need for consistent observance of Lenin's principle of the unity of ideological and organizational work. As we advance on the ideological-theoretical front, it behooves us to redouble our efforts in political propaganda, and to direct it toward mobilizing the masses for resolving the tasks of economic and socio-political development; to reinforce our ideological activity by organizational and economic work.

We have every reason to note positive changes in ideological work since the June 1983 CPSU Central Committee Plenum. But these are only the first steps. Much still remains to be done if the content, the promptness, the forms, and methods of our propaganda and its material-technical base, are to meet the increased requirements of Soviet people, and the tasks of perfecting developed socialism and of taking the offensive in the struggle against bourgeois ideology; and if we are to extirpate from the practice of propaganda the pursuit of the resounding phrase, the tedious cliches, and the attempts to evade acute questions that are of urgent concern to the working people.

The CPSU Central Committee will hold this sector of work constantly within its field of vision and require that it be given the most fixed attention by all party committees and every member of the party. One must not forget that the class enemy tries to make use of any failures here in order to infiltrate among us views and values that are alien to socialism. We must continue to educate the citizens of the country of the Soviets and our young people in the spirit of Soviet patriotism and proletarian socialist internationalism, of loyalty to the fatherland, and the ideals of the October Revolution.

It is particularly important now to use in this work the approaching 40th anniversary of the victory of the Soviet people in the Great Patriotic War.

The strength and the authority of the party are the authority of every Communist, the strength of his personal example. To a large extent people judge the party, its policy, and its ideology by the actions and the behavior of the Communist. This is why it is important to safeguard and to raise ever higher the calling and the importance of the member of the party. It is important to seek to ensure that within its ranks are indeed the best representatives of the people, the working class, the peasantry, and the intelligentsia. The best, because Communists take upon themselves everything that is the most difficult; with a knowledge of the matter in hand they boldly raise and solve the most complex social and political tasks, and they do not fear the historic responsibility that has been placed upon their shoulders. They bear it with complete consciousness of their party and civic duty. The best, because they enter the party not for the sake of any honor and privilege, but in the name of serving the lofty ideals of socialism and the interests of the working people.

All this makes Communists a force which, to use the words of Marx and Engles, is most resolute and always inducing movement forward. Now, when the CPSU in moving to meet the 27th congress in carrying out a searching review of its party affairs, it would appear to be particularly appropriate to recall these words by the founders of our revolutionary teaching.

USSR TO LAUNCH ROCKETS IN PACIFIC 25 DEC-3 JAN

FM221717 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 23 Dec 84 First Edition p 4

["TASS Report" -- PRAVDA headline]

[Text] Moscow, 21 Dec (TASS) -- In the period between 25 December 1984 and 3 January 1985, launches of carrier rockets will be carried out in the Soviet Union to regions of the Pacific Ocean, each region being confined within a circumference with a radius of 50 nautical miles and with centers with the following coordinates: 30 degrees 45 minutes North Latitude and 173 degrees 10 minutes East Longitude; 27 degrees North Latitude and 174 degrees 30 minutes East Longitude.

TASS is authorized to state that in order to ensure safety, the Government of the USSR asks governments of other countries that use sea and air routes in the Pacific Ocean to instruct the relevant organs so that sea vessels and aircraft refrain from entering these regions and the airspace above them daily between the hours 1600 and 2400 local time.

VEGA-2'S FIRST TELEMETRIC REPORTS ANALYZED

LD221212 Moscow TASS in English 1105 GMT 22 Dec 84

[Text] Moscow December 22 TASS -- Analysed has been the first telemetric information which came from the automatic station Vega, which set off for the planet Venus on December 21. This is the replica of the first one which started on its way last Saturday. The duplicate is needed to ensure reliability. Soviet scientists have been abiding by this principle in the study of the Venus for about ten years now. The Vega Project is most sophisticated -- the way to the Halley's Comet is long, and the meeting with the planet will be exceedingly brief.

It will take Vega-2 a total of 176 days to fly in the Earth-Venus route. Over the period it will cover a distance of 485 million kilometres. On June 15, 1985 the descent vehicle of the station will reach the surface of the Venus to make analysis of the rock.

264 days after the landing of the descent vehicle on the Venus, the probe will reach vicinities of the Halley's Comet. This will take place on March 9, 1986 -- at a distance of 170 million kilometres from the Earth. Vega-2 is to pass through the envelope of the comet 10,000 kilometers from its core.

Soviet, Hungarian and French scientists have designed an orginial television complex designed to take pictures of the planet on a different scale.

The Vega project is also designed for direct contacts, for receiving valuable information during the direct meeting. The original instrument, dust mass analyser, will serve that aim. The new instrument was designed by scientists of the USSR, France and FRG and is intended to obtain data on the tail of the comet -- exploration of the chemical composition, sizes and concentration of dust in its "train". All information from the far-away orbit will be operationally transmitted from radio channels back to Earth, and received by the long distance space communication centre.

The Halley's Comet could be seen even through very powerful telescopes these days as a tiny light spot. And on November 27, 1985 it will be at the minimum distance from the Earth (approximately 100 million kilometres) and then the distance will start growing again.